

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

APRIL, 1906

NO. 10

Stagnation and Movement in Great Britain.

I DO not wonder that foreigners, and even Colonials and Americans, are utterly puzzled with this funny old country. To all appearance, we ought to be the most advanced nation in Socialism on the planet. Our population is essentially a proletariat, the people being almost entirely divorced from the soil; our economic growth is certainly, as a whole, not behind that of any European community; our personal liberties and political rights have been secured to us long ago by the courage and sacrifices of our forebears; living in no fear of serious invasion, we can dispense with the military preparations and organization that hamper continental peoples. Yet, here we are only just beginning to emerge from the social arrangements and political forms of a century, or two centuries, ago. It is really very remarkable, and I still adhere to the reasons I gave in the first number of this REVIEW to account for our arrested development. When we do begin to make way, also, nobody is aware of it. The capitalist press of Great Britain, as a whole, is run for advertisements, and advertisements only. Such editors as Barnes or Delane of the *Times*, Walker of the *Daily News*, Frederick Greenwood of the *Pall Mall Gazette*—men who left their mark on their day and generation—belong to a past period. Here and there a belated exception in a minor way still remains; but for the most part an editor today edits and writes with one eye glued on the advertisement returns. When these dwindle, even temporarily, out he goes. And as Socialism and Laborism are not popular with the class that pays for advertisements we heard, until lately, very little about them in the capitalist press.

The results of the elections, therefore, though nothing at all astonishing in themselves, have come upon our dilettante, bridge-playing, motoring, golfing, pleasure-loving aristocrats, and their smug paymasters, the bourgeoisie, quite as a shock. The newspaper boycott and conspiracy of silence had deceived them. They thought there was no socialist movement at all. For years past, for example, I have been addressing as large audiences as any man in Great Britain, in London and in the provinces. I have carried on the social democratic propaganda steadily for a quarter of a century, and everybody is aware that I am an educated man. Yet, no matter how enthusiastic my hearers, or how crowded the halls, I am never reported. Much the same with others. Whatever happened, so it was assumed, the workers in this island could not be roused, and no journal would study what was going on for that axiomatic reason. We were fools and fanatics all.

And now, of course, with equal ineptitude, the significance of what has taken place is being absurdly exaggerated. As I said, when, with the hysterical excitement at present the principal characteristic of Englishmen, everybody was shouting about the "Triumph of Labor," and talking of the newly elected members as if they were heaven born geniuses of the people, suddenly developed from the mine, the mill, and the factory, this all merely connotes a tendency instead of recording a triumph. The workers here are beginning to shake themselves loose from the trammels of middle-class faction, and the sense of class-consciousness and the recognition of the class war is influencing them seriously for the first time since the Chartist movement. There is even quite a marked trend toward Socialism to be observed among tens and even hundreds of thousands of our population. But outside the men and women who are in, or who have passed through, the Social Democratic Federation, even this is, for the most part, a sentimental Socialism. We are still a long way from the formation of a thoroughly disciplined, well organized Socialist Party, and the new Labor Group has a hard task before it in the House of Commons. What has taken place, I admit, is very important; but much more as giving hope for the future than as securing anything of great value in the present.

This was seen at once at the conference of the Labor Party. Excellent resolutions were passed in the direction of socialism. Socialism and socialist speeches were cheered to the echo. But when a socialist delegate proposed that the members of the party should formerly subscribe to a definite program; when, in fact, it was suggested that the party should declare that anyone who belonged to it must be bound by the recorded decisions of the great majority of delegates there assembled; then there was an

obvious "scare," and the conference stoutly refused to decree anything so logical and so essential. The reason for this is clear. The object, quite a legitimate object as I hold, is to use the trade-union funds for political purposes, independently of either faction. But a large proportion of trade-unionists whose organizations are affiliated to the Labor Party are not in favor of socialism, except as a nebulous theory, and are not too fond of the name itself in any case. To commit the Labor Party to a definite program, therefore, would risk losing the party funds. You see.

The difference between the two sections came out very strongly on the election of the Parliamentary leader. We may not agree altogether with Keir Hardie, but he is the one man who alone has upheld the dignity of his class in Parliament, has never bowed the knee to the bourgeois Baal, and has sternly held aloof from the politicians and wire-pullers of both factions. He was entitled therefore to a unanimous vote if ever man was. In a total vote of 29, however, he was elected by a majority of only one! Three of his own Independent Labor Party men, I understand including Ramsay Macdonald, voted against him! He is a avowed socialist and his leadership might be too dangerous! Under such circumstances, it is the bounden duty of every socialist to back him, and it is quite certain that the capitalist Liberals do hate him. In the House of Commons the effect of his leadership instead of Shackleton's, the trade-unionist's, is already visible, and some of the party show signs of real vigor.

But all this proves how serious are the difficulties which lie immediately ahead of any thorough-going working-class party in Great Britain. Anywhere else the purchase of John Burns for £2000 a year and a seat in the cabinet, partly as a reward for his having defended and applauded Asquith for shooting down the miners at Featherstone, when the Liberals were last in office, would have deceived no one. Here a large section of the workers were completely gulled and flattered at one of their own men having been able to dispose of himself for such a high price, to their worst enemies. It is a remarkable fulfilment of what a very active political lady said to me nearly a quarter of a century ago, when we were at the beginning of the socialist movement in Great Britain: "You cannot win on those lines Mr. Hyndman. You will educate these men" — as a matter of fact I did educate John Burns — "and then we shall buy them, or, if we don't, the Liberals will, and that will be just the same to you." The truth is that, as Clemenceau, the brilliant French statesman and journalist said, when Lady Warwick and Jaures and he were lunching with me in Paris about a twelve month since: "*La classe ouvrière en Angleterre est une classe bourgeoisie*" — The working class in England is a bourgeois class. That is still the case.

Taken as a whole, the clothes, the talk, the manners, the ideas, the aspirations of the English working man, on the way up, are those of the bourgeoisie. They aim at being successful shopkeepers, and their economics are those of the profit-mongers. Burns has done what many of them would like to do, "£2000 a year and possibilities is good gifts." They do not understand that such an acceptance of office in a capitalist government is a betrayal of their class, whose cause as a socialist he had championed until he saw his way to mount up on their shoulders. It is sad; but Judas' acceptance of the thirty shillings did not stop the spread of Christianity, and if John hanged himself, or were hanged tomorrow, that would not make much difference either. What is important is the fact that so many English and Scotch and Welsh workers are still such idiots as to cheer. Strange to say, however, since John Burns objected to wear gold braid and lace, and a cocked hat, and then donned them, and walked about in them, in order to keep his place and his salary, his popularity has decreased greatly. People applauded the severity: they jib at the livery! But the whole posse of Liberal Labor members in the House of Commons still swear by "the Right Honorable gentleman," livery and all. They hope to wear a similar suit and get the same wages themselves by-and-bye.

Meanwhile, there is this huge Liberal majority, eager to carry pettifogging measures so as to "dish the socialists" and keep back real progress for years. Will they succeed? I doubt it. A great majority, like a great army, must be kept on the march. And when the hosts of "*Manchesterthum*", begin to move their troubles will begin. Free Trade and Chinese slavery alone wont long hold them together, and everything else has a tendency to split them up. There is not a single man of first-rate ability, not one imposing personality, not even a considerable orator among them. It is a vast aggregation of clever and pompous mediocrities, sworn in to profit-mongering, free-trade and the Nonconformist breeches-pocket conscience. All too incompetent to lead, and all too conceited to follow.

Yet the situation they have to face calls for statesmanship, and statesmen of the highest order. The old methods of the incompetent and lackadaisical House of Commons of the past twenty years cannot hope to cope with present day problems. This the socialist wing of the Labor Party already sees, and I hope and believe that a minority will be ready, if any attempt is made by the Whigs and lawyers who dominate the Ministerial mob to shirk the great class issues which are now before us, to outrage all the silly and obsolete "forms of the House" in order to force their views to the front and to stir up a great agitation in the country. A determined group of even half a dozen can bring all public business to a standstill even today. And with

thirteen million of the people of the United Kingdom on the border line of starvation, as the Prime Minister himself declared, it is high time that a breach of decorum should be perpetrated in the interest of the disinherited class. At home and abroad, in politics and economics, in the Colonies and in India, in our relations with European and Asiatic powers questions are being pressed upon public attention which cannot possibly be answered on the old lines. In every direction we find that we are behind the times. Not a single reform of any importance can be carried through without butting up against vested interests or outworn systems which block the path to new and better arrangements. Such a state of things inevitably leads to a complete and rapid transformation, either peaceable or forcible. It is in the preparation for this crucial transformation that socialists, and to some extent, mere Labor men have their opportunity. Nobody else can possibly do the necessary work; for none of the others have freed their minds from the cant and hypocrisy of the old buy-cheap and sell-dear, production-for-profit, wage-slave capitalist system. Even the vast development of monopoly does not teach those who are convinced that competition is inevitable, and that when the bourgeoisie became masters of society history had written its last page. But we are moving in spite of all this stagnation. The over-grown British Empire has at last entered upon a period of reorganization, and the late General Election will hereafter be recognized as the small but significant symptom of coming crucial change at its center.

H. M. HYNDMAN.

London, March 7, 1906.

Since the above article was written the Labor Party in the House of Commons has had some opportunities of showing what it can do and it has come out well in these preliminary trials. Keir Hardie is showing himself to be a capable and dexterous leader and there can be no doubt that the whole of the initiative is with this group. The Liberal Labor set cuts a very poor figure and will cut a still poorer in the future I venture to predict. One matter we Social-Democrats may especially congratulate ourselves upon: the apparent certainty that free meals for children will be provided in the State-supported schools at public cost. I have a special personal satisfaction in noting that this proposal is now accepted by practically the whole House and that the hopeless doctrinaire Harold Cox could not get even a seconder to his resolution against the measure. When for the first time in modern history I proposed this important reform in 1882 just twenty-four years ago it was covered with contempt and ridicule. When we of the S. D. F. went as a deputation on the subject

some thirteen years ago we were still jeered at as ignorant fanatics or even as pestilent idiots. Now, the most brutal Liberal capitalists dare not openly oppose the suggestion. At any rate, the Labor Party has acted thoroughly well in this. Then the amendment drafted by Keir Hardie to Sir W. Kitsais resolution in favor of free trade, stating that neither Free Trade nor Protection could in any way solve the previous problems of poverty, was an admirable move. It put the Liberal Party in a most awkward position and its leaders discovered that there were now some men in the House of Commons who cared not a straw for the convenience of either of the factions of plunderers. I am told it is quite amusing to watch the fidgettings of Ministers who are unable to order about this section of the workers who keep and pay them as they do their own Liberal Labor people. It is something quite new and very unpleasant. Hardie is undoubtedly the best-hated man by the Liberals in the country to-day, and that is the greatest compliment it is possible to pay him, especially as the *Times* don't love him either. Anyhow independent labor going steadily on to Socialism must grow. Everybody sees that. What is more, Great Britain and the British Empire will play an ever-increasing part in International Socialism. Up to the Congress of Amsterdam the English-speaking peoples had played a comparatively insignificant part in that magnificent and ever victorious combination. Then we began to show our strength in friendly rivalry with our sister-nationalities and brother races. At Stuttgart in August 1907 and from then onwards I hope and trust we with our Colonies and with the U. S. in Socialist accord shall take one full share in preparing the way for the complete and final Social Revolution.

H. M. HYNDMAN.

King Kerosene and The Labor Movement.

All the "literature of exposure" combined with the investigations, private and governmental, have not sufficed to show the full extent to which the industrial life and thereby the social and governmental institutions of the U. S. have come to be directed from one dominating center. This is partly because of the rapidity of events. The wild exaggerations of the demagogues of yesterday become the established statistical facts of today, and will be transformed into the conservative claims of the defenders of existing institutions by to-morrow. Some of the more recent phases of concentrated industry in America bear directly upon problems and events which are occupying socialist thought and activity at the present moment and this may excuse their discussion now, if any excuses be necessary.

When a little more than one year ago John Moody pointed out that over twenty billions of the wealth of the U. S. had passed out of the competitive system into the stage of trustified monopoly it was one of those facts that are so large that they come to be accepted as a standard. So it has come about that this bald fact is commonly stated as marking a climax of industrial concentration, yet since this statement was made there has gone on, a movement both within these trustified industries and in the relation which they bear to the remaining industrial life which is in many respects of equally great importance with the movement noted by Mr. Moody. To be sure he points out the movement to which reference is made, but its full development was not then visible.

These monopolistic industries are just those which stand at the strategic points of the industrial process and by virtue of that fact their possessors have for many purposes almost as complete control over the eighty billions of small competitive business as they have over the twenty billions to which they hold legal title. Control and ownership is only for the purpose of exploitation, through the power which it grants to determine institutions and decide the direction of the flow of the stream of social wealth.

There are certain industries within this trustified mass which stand in a dominating position to the remainder. The possessors of these keys to the inner castle of industry dominate, not simply what is encircled by the trust moat, but are able to reduce to feudal tenure all the surrounding industrial fields. In the central hall of the castle sits what has come to be known as the "Standard Oil System." A slight examination suffices to

show how completely this group of capitalists have control of the inner defences of capitalism. Transportation is the one great essentially dominating phase of modern industrial life. Moody has shown that excluding the "useless worn-out or profitless railroad mileage" that "nearly 95 per cent of the vital railroad mileage" was controlled by this group of financiers nearly two years ago. Some of the additional 5 per cent has since been brought beneath their sway. These railroads own, lease, or otherwise control the entire anthracite and most of the bituminous coal fields. Next to transportation and fuel, and perhaps fully as basic as either, are the iron and steel industries owned by the same interests. In the mining of precious metals the prospecting and excavating with its gambling risk is still left to the competitive field, but the Standard Oil smelter trust stands ready to take the regular assured profits. With copper the case is different. Here the mines themselves are controlled and the new field of electrical industry is thereby reached and dominated wherever direct ownership has not been exercised. The lighting of the cities and electric transportation,—urban, suburban, and interurban—has likewise passed into the hands of the Standard Oil Group.

Banking and life insurance have long been controlled by this same body of men. In respect to the former they have the active assistance of the U. S. government, the utilization of its reserve and the opportunity to speculate upon all its financial transactions. Indeed the control which this group exercises over all political institutions is a most striking exemplification of that marvelous sentence in the "Communist Manifesto" which tells us that "the government of the modern state is but a committee for transacting the common affairs of the capitalist class." If Tom Lawson's statement is to be believed, and he has never yet been contradicted on this point, H. H. Rogers was able to show a statement signed by a majority of the members of the U. S. Senate testifying to their ownership by the Standard Oil Co. The most powerful man in the U. S. government to-day is by no means the strenuous occupant of the White House, but Senator Nelson W. Aldrich of Rhode Island, whose daughter is married to one of the scions of the house of Rockefeller. In the West the state governments of Montana, Colorado and Idaho are but departments of the same Standard Oil trust while the domination of New Jersey and Rhode Island political institutions is no less complete.

If the domination of social institutions stopped here it would simply mean that capitalism was only directing what was rightfully its own so long as the workers permitted capitalism to rule. It is a recognized principle of social evolution that in every social stage the ruling class fashions these governmental and so-

cial institutions in its own interest, and must continue so to do until another class shall have overthrown them.

But The Standard Oil Group has not stopped with the institutions mentioned. It has gone on and set about formulating and directing those institutions which are supposed to especially represent working class interests. It has laid its hand upon the organized labor movement and proposes to direct and control that with the same ease with which it manages the trains upon its railroads, the oil along its pipe lines, the judges upon the bench, the senators, representatives and President, in its political branch. The particular instrument through which it exercises this control is the National Civic Federation. In furtherance of its plan for control of the labor movement of America as represented in the American Federation of Labor it developed the idea of the existence and power and importance of the "public." According to this philosophy there is somewhere in the world a great "third party" to all industrial controversies, which suffers in all strikes and is impartial in all contests between laborers and capitalists. In the organization of the Civic Federation therefore it selects its governing bodies from the three great divisions into which it pretends society is divided, i. e. capitalists, laborers and the "public." Let us examine those who are thus chosen to represent the public. We shall find that the character of these men gives us a key to the understanding of the philosophy upon which the Civic Federation is based.

I have made a careful study of all those who have served as representing the "public" from the time of the formation of the National Civic Federation; including all who have resigned, died or in any way terminated their office, as well as those who are functioning at present.

First is a small class who require little comment, embracing Arch-Bishop John Ireland, Bishop Henry C. Potter, and Chas. W. Eliot. The latter, President of Harvard University, is chiefly remarkable as having the honor to be the first to discover that the scab was the great "American hero." These men are so notoriously the puppets of capitalism as to need no discussion.

Let us proceed to the others: (*)

Grover Cleveland,—President, *N. Y. Life Insurance Co.*

Cornelius N. Bliss, Ex-Secretary of the Treasury, Director American Cotton Co., *Equitable Life*, Fourth National Bank, Home Insurance Co., Trustee Am. Surety Co., and *Central Trust Co.*

*) In making up this information I have consulted the "Directory of Directors" for the cities of New York, Chicago and Boston, the "Financial Year Book," "Who's Who," Moody's "Manual of Corporation Securities" and "Truth about The Trusts," and various other biographical and financial authorities. I have italicized some of the best known "Standard Oil" enterprises. In every case so italicized one of the Rockefellers or H. H. Rogers is a director, or else it is openly admitted that the industry is owned by some "dominating" Standard Oil enterprise.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

Oscar S. Strauss—President N. Y. Board of Trade and Transportation, Trustee, *N. Y. Life*.

Charles Francis Adams—Former President *U. P. R. R.*, Chairman Board of Directors of Kansas City Stock Yards Co. of Mo. and director Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Co. (latter is claimed to be under Rockefeller influence, but evidence incomplete).

Isaac N. Seligman—Banker, Member Advisory Committee *Stockholders Audit Co. of N. Y.*, Treas. and Director City and Suburban Homes Co., Trustee in U. S. for Munich Reinsurance Co., and Rossia Insurance Co. of St. Petersburg.

David R. Francis.—Pres. La. Exposition, Commission Grain Merchant; "Who's Who" says, "Has large interests in corporations of St. Louis, First Vice-President Merchants' Laclede National Bank; "Financial Red Book" says, "Bond Broker, Director Miss. Valley Trust Co.

James Speyer—Director B. & O. R. R., Trustee *Central Trust Co.*, General Chemical Co., German Savings Bank, Member Board of Managers Girard Trust Co., Director Lackawanna Steel Co., *Manhattan Co.*, Trustee *Mutual Life*, Director North British & Mercantile Insurance Co., London & Edinburgh Insurance Co., Director Pacific Mail Steamship Co., Treas. and Trustee Provident Loan Society of N. Y., Director S. P. Co., Speyer Building Co., Underground Electric Railways of London, Trustee Union Trust Co.

Franklin McVeagh—Merchant, Trustee Chicago Penny Savings' Bank Society, Director Commercial National Bank, Commercial Deposit Co., and Fay-Sholes Co. Also an active member of the Chicago Employers' Association and Merchants Teaming Co., which imported scabs to break the teamster's strike in 1905.

Jas. H. Eckels—Former Controller of the Currency, Director Allis Chalmers, Am. & British Securities Co., *Am. Surety Co.* Bankers' Trust Co., Oakland Nat'l Bank, President and Director Commercial National Bank, Trustee Chicago Real Estate Trustees, Director Fay-Sholes Co., Treas. & Director Featherstone Foundry & Machine Co., V. Pres. & Director Hewitt Manufacturing Co.

John J. McCook—Lawyer, Trustee *Am. Surety Co.*, Director *Equitable Life*, International Banking Corp., Mercantile Trust Co., Wells-Fargo & Co. Trustee Sun Insurance Co.

John G. Milburn—Lawyer, President Pan-Am. Expo. He is in the "Financial Red Book," which indicates that he deals principally with corporation business. There is no "Directory of Directors" for Buffalo, where he lives. He is the man at whose house Pres. McKinley died. A strong light is thrown upon his connections however by the fact that he is a partner with

Lewis Cass Ledyard, in the firm of "Milburn, Ledyard & Carter" of N. Y. Mr. Ledyard is described as follows in the N. Y. "Directory of Directors," Director Am. Ex. Co., Trustee Atlantic Insurance Co., Director Boston & Me. R. R., President and Director Franklin Building Co., Director Great Northern Paper Co., Maine Cent. R. R., Merchant's Despatch Trans. Co., Trustee *Metropolitan Trust Co.*, V. Pres. & Director National Express Co., Director Newport Trust Co., & *U. S. Trust Co.*

Chas. J. Bonaparte—Secretary of the Navy, In "Financial Red Book." Is closely connected with Standard Oil Interests in many ways.

Everett Macy—Gives occupation as "Capitalist" in Directory. Director of Am. Cold Storage Shipping Co., Bank of Long Island, Trustee and Director City Club Realty Co., Deutz Lithographing Co., Leather Manufactures' National Bank, Lowe Coke and Gas Securities Co., Oro Grande Placer Mining Co. (A part of the great Standard Oil Mining Trust,—has its offices at 26 Broadway), Trustee Provident Loan Society of N. Y., Director *Queens' Borough Gas and Electric Co.*

Thus we see that practically every member who is supposed to represent the "public" in this organization is not only in fact a representative of capitalist interests, but is a direct agent of the one great central dominating financial and industrial force in American life—"The Standard Oil System." This is the first time in the history of the world that the forces of labor have been committed to the direction of great capitalist interests. It is a phenomenon unique in history and we hope it may be short in duration and never be duplicated.

There has been one branch of the labor movement, however, that Standard Oil has been unable to bring beneath its domination. This is that portion known as the Western Federation of Miners and which is now finding its widest expression in the Industrial Workers of the World. Unable to conquer this body of men by trickery and intrigue the magnates of the Standard Oil declared bitter, merciless war upon them. Just how thoroughly premeditated this war was is shown by a quotation from the Rockefeller controlled "Boston News Bureau" in 1902. This publication, when discussing the Amalgamated Copper Company, spoke as follows of H. H. Rogers: "Mining men in Montana believe that if he secures control of these forces he will be in a position to reduce wages in Montana and make Butte the low-cost-copper district of the world." "These forces" were Heinze and the Rothschild copper interests. Rogers secured control of these forces and the present conspiracy for murder having for its object the railroading of Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone to the gallows and thereby crushing the only labor organization

that has refused to be bought or deceived is but a part of the movement to "make Butte" the low-cost-copper district of the world."

At one stage of this war upon the W. F. M. Standard Oil called upon the Civic Federation to play its part and its secretary sent a telegram to the notorious Peabody asking that a discrimination be made between the W. F. M. and the A. F. of L. Peabody at once responded that this would be done.

In spite of this domination of the leaders of the A. F. of L., however, the rank and file of union members have refused to be lead into battle against their fellow workers when the fight was in the open, and one of the most striking signs of the solidarity of the working class that the last century has produced is the readiness with which the Trade Unions connected with the A. F. of L. and particularly the U. M. W. are coming to the assistance of the victims of the murderous conspiracy against the W. F. M. officers. As yet, however, Gompers has distinguished himself by his masterly inactivity, and his profound silence.

A. M. SIMONS.

Marxism or Eclecticism.

What is Marxism? Is it what Marx himself, and those who accept his fundamental statements, say it is, or is it what some who call themselves Marxists, but who pick out at random from the Marxian structure what suits them, say it is?

This seems to become one of the great issues in the development of scientific socialism, which we must meet sooner or later. We might as well take the bull by the horns before it gets any farther.

We must not only keep continually in mind, in what respect Marxism and eclecticism differ, but we must also realize that only one of these can be the logical historical guiding star of the international Socialist Party.

I say "party" advisedly. I know very well that the Socialist Movement is larger than the Socialist Party. No one can pretend to get the "Movement" in line with Marxian thought. So long as the movement stays outside of the party, it constitutes a host of sympathizers, who may or may not be Marxians. They may have many reasons for staying out of the party which we must respect. But at any rate, they have no direct influence on the development of the party, least of all its intellectual development. They do not lead, they follow the party.

So much for the "Movement". But the party is the directing element of the historical process in present society. It at least can and must have a definite course to steer, if it would be the consciously directing force of social evolution. It must be united on this course and steer it with the unanimous consent and co-operation of the overwhelming majority of its members. Otherwise it will be dashed against the rocks of historical failure, and the social process will drift into other channels than those of proletarian emancipation from class rule.

Of course, I do not think for a moment that this eventuality can ever take place. If the Marxian method is reliable — and I have the scientific conviction that it is — then the great majority of the members of the Socialist Party must always be class-conscious proletarians, and this must insure inevitably the predominance of Marxian thought in the Socialist Party.

Nevertheless, the growth of eclecticism may seriously interfere with the normal development of the proletarian majority into clear Marxian thinkers.

There is a great deal of unclearness in our ranks as to what constitutes Marxism, what is its relation to the Darwinian

theory of natural selection, to the theory of evolution in general, and to the theory of understanding formulated by Josef Dietzgen as the keystone of the proletarian conception of the universe.

The Marxian theories of surplus-value, of the class-struggle, of historical materialism, and Josef Dietzgen's theory of understanding, are inseparable. They dovetail into one another and form one connected line of reasoning, which clearly reflects the historical process. Tear out any of these links, and you break the continuity of Marxian thought and lose the thread of historical development.

The materialist conception of history is the logical fundament of Marxism. Marx, Engels, and Dietzgen arrived at its conception by way of philosophical materialism. Once that Marx had recognized that "the mode of production of the material requirements of life determines the general character of the social, political, and spiritual life," and that the transformation of the mode of production was the cause of social revolutions, the theory of class-struggles was the inevitable corollary. And in order to find the compelling motive of the productive process, Marx analyzed this process, found that capitalist production was carried on solely for the sake of profit, and that this profit consisted overwhelmingly of surplus-products stolen from the laborer in the process of production. Therefore the interests of the laborer and the capitalists are diametrically opposed, therefore the class-struggle of the proletariat against the capitalist class, therefore a political revolution as the result of the industrial revolution, therefore proletarian thought antagonistic to bourgeois thought. But if economic conditions shape the thought of men so forcibly as to compel them to a definite line of political action, then it must be shown that the whole human *soul life* is indeed nothing but a response to material stimuli, and not only to economic stimuli, but to all stimuli coming from the social, terrestrial, and cosmic environment. Josef Dietzgen's theory of understanding does that. Thus Marx-Engels and Dietzgen join hands as philosophical materialists. But class-struggles in human society, thus brought about by material stimuli on human brains, are but a human portion of the struggle for existence, which runs through the whole of the universe. This leads inevitably to an acceptance of the general theory of evolution. So it is evident that not only the three fundamental theories of Marx and Engels dovetail into one another and into Dietzgen's theory of theory of natural selection and the Spencerian theory of universal evolution.

This is the actual condition of the matter. Its result is materialist monism as a conception of the universe, with the class-conscious proletariat as the historical champion of this universal monist science. For I shall presently show that there

is no other consistent monism but proletarian monism. Marxism is an inseparable part of this science, and its three fundamental postulates, the production of surplus-value by exploited wage-workers, social evolution through class-struggles, and the materialist conception of history, make this science strictly a proletarian one, so long as the modern class-struggle will rage. Of course, to the extent that the evolution toward socialism continues, this monist science will gradually become the accepted guide of a greater and greater portion of mankind, until the inauguration of the co-operative commonwealth of the world will make materialist monism the light of this world and replace theological religions and metaphysical ethics.

Marxism is uncompromisingly opposed to all that is bourgeois, or capitalistic. Marx and Engels bristled up at the mere suspicion that anything which they said or did was in any way suggestive of bourgeois antecedents. And this aversion on their part was not a mere reaction against the narrow hatred of the bourgeois for the proletarian, but the scientific understanding that all proletarian thought is necessarily and irreconcilably opposed to all bourgeois life.

On the other hand, some of our eclectic comrades are as reluctant to acknowledge and proclaim the existence of this chasm between proletarian and bourgeois thought, as a class-conscious proletarian is naturally eager for an emphatic declaration of this fact. I am not speaking here of those comrades, who join the socialist party or movement for sentimental or other reasons which are anything but an acceptance of Marxism. Of course, I combat the metaphysical idealism of these comrades. But these, at least, do not claim to be Marxians. They are frankly opposed to Marxism and want to shift the entire socialist movement to a new idealist foundation. They are really harmless, because there is no danger of their ever being taken seriously by the class-conscious proletariat. When I speak of eclecticism, I refer to those comrades who call themselves Marxians, or scientific socialists, yet reject most of the fundamental demands of Marxism as conceived by Marx and Engels.

We have seen two illustrations of this tendency quite recently in the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW for October, 1905. Comrade Marcus Hitch there declares that the "gist of Marxism" consists for him in the "political doctrine" of Marx, but that he does not agree with the founder of scientific socialism so far as materialism and economics are concerned. In other words, according to Marx, the gist of Marxism consists of the philosophical, economic, and political conclusions resulting from the Marxian theories. But according to comrade Hitch, the gist of Marxism consists in what Hitch chooses to pick out of the Marxian thought. Not enough with this eclectic procedure,

comrade Hitch adds a touch of genuine humor to his statements by the serio-comic appeal that the attention devoted by some socialists to Marxian economics and philosophy, with which he does not agree, may not cause "the political doctrine of Marx to become obscured," with which he agrees. His warning is addressed to the wrong quarter. He should rather be solicitous, lest those, who like himself pick out from the Marxian doctrine what suits their esoteric taste, might obscure, not only the economic and philosophical theories of Marx, but also his political "doctrine." There is little danger that those who accept all of Marx's theories will permit any of them to become obscured.

In the same number, comrade Henry Bergen declares that "the materialist conception of history has no necessary connection with philosophical materialism"; that he is not quite sure whether Marx and Engels were philosophical materialists, since the "authorities" disagree on this point; that even if they were, it was their own private affair, "a thing quite apart from their theory of history, which, like the theory of evolution with which it stands in such intimate relation, is concerned with matters dynamic, not statical"; that the majority of the problems discussed by Dietzgen, for instance his theory of understanding, "have no exclusive bearing on socialism, and have been discussed in much the same manner by philosophers who were not socialists."

Truly, things are scattered around pretty loosely in comrade Bergen's head! So, the historical materialism of Marx and Engels is intimately related with the theory of evolution, yet there is no necessary connection, in his opinion, between these theories and philosophical materialism and Dietzgen's theory of understanding. I wish comrade Bergen would point out how these things can logically and scientifically be disconnected! Here is a task for which church and state would be glad to honor and worship him, if he could succeed in establishing his claims! His statement that as soon as "materialism is rounded off into a philosophical "system"—monistic, pluralistic, or otherwise—it at once becomes saturated, so to speak, with metaphysical elements (Hæckel's *Riddle of the Universe* is a good example) and forfeits all rights to be taken seriously as a philosophy," is very good so far as Hæckel is concerned, but does not apply to Dietzgen. Neither Marx nor Dietzgen have ever founded a system. On the contrary, both have strenuously objected to being saddled with any such merits. Their claim is solely that they discovered a universal "method" which does away for once and all with all philosophical "systems." Comrade Bergen must know this, and yet he claims that Dietzgen has discussed philosophical problems in much the same manner as philosophers who were not socialists. He might as well claim

that Marx has discussed economic questions in much the same way as Adam Smith, Ricardo, or Proudhon.

If Comrade Bergen is in doubt whether Marx and Engels were philosophical materialists, let him read "The Holy Family," "Anti-Dühring," "Feuerbach," and Engels's introduction to "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific." There he can see what Marx and Engels themselves said they were. Never mind the disagreeing "authorities."

They were philosophical materialists, according to their own confession. And this philosophical materialism is no more their private affair, than their historical materialism. With the same justification, comrade Bergen might claim that their theory of value was their own private affair, or that the ideas laid down in the "Communist Manifesto" were their own private affair. I wish comrade Bergen would explain, how one can be an idealist, and yet believe in the materialist conception of history, or vice versa. Or how one can be a believer in historical materialism, and yet reject the inductive method of scientific materialism in the discussion of philosophical problems. Or how a theory which is intimately related to the theory of evolution can be a thing apart from philosophical materialism. If he can prove that this can logically and historically be made to harmonize, then I am willing to admit that philosophical materialism and historical materialism are not based on the same fundamental conceptions.

One of the most conspicuous of this class of eclectics is comrade Ernest Belfort Bax, of England. In his *Outlooks From The New Standpoint*, and in his discussion of historical materialism with Kautsky, in the *Neue Zeit*, he makes unsuccessful attempts to read into the materialist conception of history something which neither Marx, nor Engels, nor Kautsky, intended to convey by it, and demonstrate that this Marxian method does not explain all historical phenomena, especially in case they are intellectual phenomena. At least I take it that he is criticizing the Marxian method, and not some other. But about that later. I am not going to dwell on this discussion. It may be read in the original. I merely wish to state emphatically that such a conditional acceptance of the materialist conception of history is its virtual repudiation. For if the materialist conception of history does not suffice to explain all phenomena of social evolution, then some of them must be explained by a method which is not materialist, and which can therefore be only an idealist method. But this is an irreconcilable contradiction. It is no wonder, then, that comrade Bax has nothing but sneers for Dietzgen's theory of understanding and especially resents the idea that it should claim to be a proletarian theory, saying that he would rather study Hæckel than Dietzgen, when he

wants to learn anything about materialist monism. We shall presently see that this takes him still farther away from Marxism.

Is Hæckel really such an unbiased scientist that a proletarian may be excused for following him rather than Dietzgen? If he is, then Bax may find a good many followers. If he is not, then the class-conscious proletariat will prefer to follow Dietzgen rather than Hæckel and Bax.

Let us first take issue with Bax. Historical materialism is the logical application of the method of modern philosophical materialism to social evolution. It looks upon man as a being which is for the present the last product of natural selection in the development of animal life on earth, the outcome of an interaction between the cosmic, terrestrial, and social environment. This social environment has been created out of the natural environment by means of the human brain function, a function which philosophical materialism regards as a product of universal evolution, the same as man himself, and which historical materialism declares to be prominently influenced by changes in the economic conditions. This is the Marxian conception, elaborated by Dietzgen, and explicitly endorsed by both Marx and Engels. Any random selection of any of these essential elements, and the repudiation of the others is not Marxism, much less the gist of Marxism.

This shows at the first glance that neither Marx nor Engels have ever claimed that human thought life is exclusively evolved out of the economic environment. They claim merely that the general trend of human thought is predominantly influenced by economic conditions. Yet Bax intimates that the materialist conception of history, or, as he calls it, the economic interpretation of history, attempts to "evolve the manysidedness of human life out of one of its factors." And he comes to the startling conclusion that the materialist conception of history, beg pardon, the economic interpretation of history, as a method of historical research, "presupposes in an advanced society an inequality of economic conditions, the existence of classes, or, in other words, the private holding of property." That is to say, the economic interpretation of history, according to Bax, cannot be used to explain the scope of thought life in primitive societies, or in the co-operative commonwealth. One is dumbfounded on reading such an assertion, when one remembers that it is precisely the economic interpretation of history which in the hands of Marx, Engels, and Lewis H. Morgan revealed the nature of primitive societies, demonstrated the origin of class societies, and gave a forecast of social evolution toward socialism.

I wish Comrade Bax would tell us clearly just what is the essential difference, in his opinion, between the economic inter-

pretation of history and the materialist conception of history, and who is, according to him, the author of the economic interpretation of history. At present there is a decided vagueness in all his criticisms, for no one can exactly tell against whom or what these criticisms are directed. I wish he would tell us plainly whether he is criticising the Marxian materialist conception of history, especially its application by Marx and Engels themselves, whether he is merely criticising the extreme application of Marx's theory by some of his impossibilist followers, or whether the "economic interpretation of history" of which he speaks is something entirely different from the Marxian materialist conception of history. I know that others, for instance Enrico Ferri, prefer the term economic determinism and use it synonymously with historical materialism. But I don't know whether Comrade Bax regards these terms as identical, and I for one should like to know "where I am at" when I am reading the Baxian writings.

If his criticisms are aimed at the materialist conception of history as originated and applied by Marx and Engels,—and a good many passages of his writings certainly read as though they were so directed—then he completely misinterprets the purpose and bearing of that theory. That he does not apply it logically, is amply proved by some of his writings. And for this reason we need not wonder that he takes exception, in a more recent issue of *Neue Zeit*, to Dietzgen's proletarian philosophy. A man who can explain a part of history by materialist, and another part by materialist methods, will find nothing strange in explaining the function of a proletarian brain partly by bourgeois and partly by proletarian methods, or perhaps entirely by bourgeois methods.

Haeckel's monism, which Bax prefers to the proletarian monism of Josef Dietzgen, is not a consistent monism. Proletarian monism takes into account all "the many-sided factors of human life," while Haeckel's monism tries to exclude from a scientific analysis of this life the historical claims of the proletarian factor. While Bax vaguely accuses some one—I don't know whom—of applying the "economic interpretation of history" too narrowly, Haeckel does not apply it at all. No sooner is Haeckel asked to go to the logical conclusion of his so-called monism and apply the idea of natural selection to the class-struggle, than he ceases to be an unbiased monist and feels himself as one of the "noblest and best," a member of the ruling class. He operates brilliantly with the materialist conception of animal history in general, but declines to have anything to do with the materialist conception of the history of the human animal in particular. The ridiculous inconsistency of this sort of "monism" has never come home to him. Yet in spite of this

fact, Bax would rather accept Haeckel's unclear bourgeois monism than the clear proletarian monism of Dietzgen. But so long as Haeckel does not realize that a materialist monist must be a historical materialist, just so long does his monism remain imperfect. And so long as Bax ignores this fact, he can still learn a whole lot from Dietzgen.

The evident fact is that the biological work of Haeckel, the historical work of Marx and Engels, and the philosophical work of Dietzgen are equally necessary for the formulation of a consistent monism. In the last analysis, monism requires the co-operation of all human sciences, each science being but a link in the division of labor between specialists. And it would be just as inconsistent on our part to reject Haeckel's splendid biological contribution to monism, as it is on the part of Bax to belittle Dietzgen's very essential philosophical contribution.

The most essential difference between proletarian and bourgeois monism lies deeper than Bax suspects. All that is Marxian rests on the revolutionary method which is opposed to the old symptomatic, or reform, method of bourgeois politics and science. This revolutionary method is the expression of the scientific understanding, that only a fundamental removal of bourgeois society can cure the evils of that society. This is what distinguishes Marxian economics and politics from bourgeois economics and politics. This is what distinguishes the proletarian (positive) school of criminology from the classic bourgeois school of criminology. This is that makes any science proletarian as distinguished from bourgeois science.

Since Dietzgen's theory of understanding is an integral part of Marxism, according to the testimony of Marx and Engels themselves, it must likewise differ by this revolutionary method from bourgeois theories of understanding. And it does. It expresses the revolutionary fact that the human mind — meaning the mind of mankind, not that of a handful of thinkers — cannot come to its normal development, cannot become conscious of the means by which its mission on earth and in the universe is to be fulfilled, until bourgeois society is abolished. This fact makes of Dietzgen's theory of understanding, and the proletarian monism following from it, a revolutionary theory, which is as much opposed to Haeckel's bourgeois monism as socialism is to capitalism.

It is this fact, furthermore, which stamps all philosophy, other than proletarian, as metaphysical, in other words, as unscientific. No less a man than Kant, the bourgeois philosopher, declared that metaphysics can never be a science. Now, philosophy does not lose its metaphysical garments and become a science, until it adopts the conclusions of Dietzgen's theory of understanding, until it realizes that the development of the

human mind as a part of universal evolution is inseparably connected with the proletarian revolution. But Haeckel's monism, being a bourgeois monism, will never admit or understand this, and therefore it remains metaphysical and imperfect as a science. Proletarian monism, on the other hand, is a consistent and perfect science of natural development and excludes the last vestiges of metaphysics.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The proof of science (including scientific philosophy) is in the testimony of historical evolution. The Marxian theories stand vindicated by fifty years of proletarian development. And with the advance of the proletarian revolution, the necessity and scientific truth of Dietzgen's theory of understanding stand out in ever bolder relief.

When bourgeois schools will teach proletarian revolution and admit proletarian teachers on the same terms as bourgeois teachers, then it will be time enough to admit that the thinkers of the ruling class are unbiased scientists. Until then I shall prefer to trust to proletarian science. For my part, I am not afraid of losing the ground from under my feet, if I do not continually seek for points of contact with bourgeois thought. The historical development takes good care, through the presence of ruling classes, that we do not get away from bourgeois ideas. And it is not in the least necessary that some of our good comrades should be everlastingly adulterating our clear proletarian bugle calls by their hybridization of bourgeois and proletarian ideas. Instead of weakening and confusing our movement by their semi-bourgeois meandering, they had better help us to beat a few new ideas into the dull bourgeois brains.

At any rate, I rely on a majority of class-conscious and thoroughly revolutionary proletarians as the only trustworthy bulwark against the corrosive effect of an eclecticism, which, if it is not an echo of bourgeois dreams, is certainly permeated by the mist of metaphysics and is too vague and vascillating to point the way unerringly to the culminating point of the proletarian revolution.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

The Land of Graft.

One of the first acquaintances we made after pitching our summer camp beside one of the beautiful streams in northern Indian Territory was Don Murphy. Mr. Murphy was a queer mixture of Scotch-Irish and Cherokee. He possessed the industry of the Scotch, the wit of the Irishman and the love of nature of the Indian, coupled with the culture acquired at Indian schools, making him a most agreeable companion.

One day we were discussing matters of government and the subject of corruption among public officials was broached. It proved to be Don's hobby, and as he was unusually well informed he told us many a thrilling tale of graft and the grafters.

"Graft! graft! What do you know of graft? You have never lived in Indian Territory," he cried with flashing eyes and face expressing intense disgust. "There may be bigger grafters in the cities, but there are more of them in round numbers in Indian Territory than in all rest of the United States combined. Why the whole history of the Cherokees from the signing of the treaties by bribed misrepresentatives, down to the enrollment of the last papoose is one long tale of graft and grafters large and small. You have read a lot about the immense sums of money expended on the lazy Indian by the Government, but mark my words, the Indian has received little but red tape and the grafter has come in for the rest. What was not absorbed between Washington and the Agency by the big grafters was quickly gobbled up by the little ones after it arrived. You have heard that 'For the ways that are dark and tricks that are vain, the Heathen Chinese is peculiar,' but don't believe it ma'am, don't believe it, an Indian Territory grafter would give the wiliest Chink that ever batted a bias eye, a whole sleeve full of aces and beat him every game."

Thinking to turn our conversation into a more pacific channel I mentioned our intended trip to the capital city of the nation in the near future and spoke of the usual beauty of the town, its air of prosperity, splendid homes and well kept lawns. "But what maintains your town?" I asked. "I can't understand how so beautiful and prosperous a town exists without some sort of industries or means of support. What class of people are its inhabitants?"

"Grafters ma'am, grafters, every one but a few women who do the grafters' washing and a few who curry their horses and care for their lawns." "Oh! But there must be some legitimate

business men," I expostulated, "you are unjust." "Well possibly ma'am, but they are scarce as hens' teeth, scarce as hens' teeth. There are a few legitimate business men in the Territory but they are the new comers and men of small means. The men who not yet learned how much easier it is to make a living by grafting than by business, and how flowery the path of the grafter is made, or the men who are naturally too honest to ever be anything but poor."

Thinking perhaps Mr. Murphy's aversion to the grafting fraternity might have caused him to exaggerate I decided to investigate the matter, and far from finding an exaggeration, I found it just about as impossible to overdraw the situation as to exaggerate in painting a rainbow.

In discussion the Indian question the important fact is always overlooked that the Indian belongs to one evolutionary stage of society and the white to another. Most Indian Territory tribes belong to that barbarian, fraternal order in which the aucestors of the white men existed before the introduction of the slave economy, not savages, but not yet civilized. The white race has passed through the slave system, Feudalism, and a few hundred years of capitalism since that pre-historic period, occupying many thousand years in the journey. Since civilization is but the slow process of evolution it is but natural that we should have failed to pick the Indian up out of barbarism and land him at one leap into civilization. It took some thousands of years for the Anglo-Saxon to reach our present civilized state and it is the height of presumption and folly for us to expect the Indian to reach it in a few decades.

Lacking the experiences of the white man it is but natural that he should lack his characteristics also. The Indian is not fond of work for in his natural state such labor as civilization demands was not necessary. He has no ancestry of slave, serf and wage-worker behind him to produce the tendency and ability to labor. He is not a business man for trading was unknown and unpracticed within the tribe. He is a little hazy in his ideas of private property for in the tribe there was no such thing as "mine and thine," everything was owned and shared in common. He may even get tangled up in the meshes of the law now and then, for laws and lawyers were an unperpetrated evil in his stage of society. The Indian is neither the "Noble Red Man of the forest," the angelic hero sentimentalists are wont to rave over, or the blood thirsty thief and murderer he has been painted. He is just a man in the childhood of the race as our ancestors were, just a little parcel of the fargone past, ruthlessly tossed into the hustling present and as a natural result he does not fit into the ways of the white man, hence is being trampled out of existance.

The full-blood is rapidly disappearing under the hot-house, forcing process we have inflicted upon him, the mixed blood is being assimilated by the white race, and through the law of the survival of the fittest, the Indian is fast disappearing; meanwhile that parasite, peculiar to this age, the grafter, flourishes like a Trust after a Federal investigation.

The colonists who settled this country knew nothing of evolution, and could not understand that the Indian was simply a product of a stage of society through which they had long since passed, and lacking the experiences of the white man could not have his natural tendencies. They expected to find the Indian nature the same as white, and finding themselves mistaken in this surmise, decided he was a child of Satan and set about righteously exterminating them as fast as possible.

The government officials who have charge of Indian affairs seem to have guiltless of any knowledge of the law of evolution also and have proceeded along the line of tin-plating the Indian with our civilization. If the Indian failed to survive the method, why the worse for the Indian, that was all.

When the white settlers desired land occupied by the Indians they simply drove them off by force of arms, in which they had the assistance of the United States Government. If warfare grew tedious the white men smoked the pipe of peace with his red brothers and made treaties which gave the white men the land and the Indian the treaty and an invitation to "move on." When the Indians had "moved on" and the white men had moved after him until about all the desirable land seemed occupied, Uncle Sam made a treaty with the so-called "five civilized tribes" by which they were to give up land in eastern states, and were to receive all the land west of Arkansas, north of Texas, south of Kansas and as far west as land extended, to have and hold as long as water runs and grass grows. In addition the Indians were to have the protection of the United States troops to protect their land from intruders, white men who should seek to usurp the Indians' domain. Of course, in time the intruder came and in the unwinding of the red tape necessary to deal with him it was always the Indian who became entangled and the intruder escaped. But that is another story, too long to be told now.

The Indian really did not need quite such an extensive backyard as old Indian Territory and from time to time Uncle Sam has carved off a slice until at the present time, the backyard fence is the east line of Oklahoma. Small as is the Indians' domain at the present time, it is a land of untold richness, and thereon hangs the tale of the grafter.

A land of beautiful prairies where succulent grass covers the ground with a carpet of richest emerald, of alluvial valleys where the farmer finds rich reward for the labor of his hands,

of clear sparkling streams and magnificent forests. A land where flowers bloom and luscious fruit grows by the wayside, and underneath it all, great beds of coal, reservoirs of oil and lakes of asphalt.

The Indian is not a farmer and the government has utterly failed to induce him to till his fertile soil; he has no use for coal, does not need oil and prefers plain dirt to asphalt. He is possessed of great wealth but in a form for which he cares nothing, and since the passion for barter, the greed for gain is lacking in his make-up he falls a ready prey to the white man who has over run his land.

The treaties with the Indians like all laws and legal documents were written by lawyers and naturally they are so obscure and far fetched in construction as to be unintelligible to the lay mind and must perforce be untangled from their legal verbage by one of the profession, so lawyers enter on the ground floor in the land of Graft and have proven past masters of the art. The unlimited opportunities for the Indian Territory lawyer to turn an honest penny is quite beyond the comprehension of the average mind. Naturally the real, large, luscious plums fall to the lot of the favored few, the real aristocracy of Grafterdom, the lawyers with a pull with government officials "higher up." The fee of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars paid one firm of attorneys for representing a tribe before the Department of the Interior is one example and there are many more quite as striking. Then there are the lesser lights who do not come in on the "big things" but who manage to find lucrative occupation without delving very deeply into musty law books. Great corporations have come to Indian Territory to bring the stores of unlimited mineral wealth from beneath the earth and there are many negotiations between the corporations and the Indians which means fat fees for the lawyers.

The Grafting fraternity is a great, powerful machine, resembling in many ways the political gangs or rings of cities. First come the "Big Bosses" possibly five or six in number, each Nation having its own, they are always lawyers, sometimes bankers also and heir to the juiciest plums because of influence with Government officials. Then comes the sub-bosses who are either bankers or lawyers and so distributed that all the territory is covered. Next the small fry of petty officials and small business men and last the little fellow who is always a half-breed and acts as go-between. These are necessary because of the Indian's suspicion of his white brother and strong tribal feeling.

When some corporation casts a longing eye on a good vein of coal or rich oil prospect on the allotment of an Indian its representative does not go to the Indian and make an offer. Oh! No! Not at all. First it would be useless, the Indian would

only grunt and refuse to listen, then it would be a breech of business ethics also. Every cog in the machine must be kept well greased or it will squeak and anything that attracts attention to graft is bad for the grafter.

When a valuable lease is desired by a corporation the manager calls in the boss of that particular nation and makes his wants known. The boss in turn calls the sub-boss who calls the small fry half-breed lieutenant and instructs him to secure a lease on the land. If the lease is made for a stated figure the half-breed is to have a few hundred dollars for his work. The half-breed in all the glory of his store clothes and yellow shoes hies himself away to the home of his tribesman and takes up his abode, and proceeds to talk the owner into making a lease. He expatiates on the desirability of leases, excites his host's desire for store clothes, yellow shoes, rubber tired buggies and shot-guns and finally mentions the fact that he has influence with a corporation which might be induced to lease his friend's land. Soon the half-breed with his victim in tow arrives at the office of the sub-boss and for a mere pittance of the real value a lease is executed, the matter of future royalties of course being conveniently forgotten. When the Indian with his characteristic ignorance of the value of money has had one big spree he will find himself penniless, the little grafters have his money, the big ones his land and poor Lo is in a sad plight indeed.

Some of the more intelligent mixed bloods have found it would be to their advantage to deal direct with homeseekers and investors and have attempted to rebel against the exactions of the fraternity, but all in vain. All leases must be approved by the Department of the Interior and it has been found that no matter how advantageous to the Indian the terms of a lease may be, if it does not bear the name of one of the elect as agent it will scarcely be ratified. Finding rebellion useless Indian and homeseeker alike are forced to bow to the inevitable and furnish their ratio of the oil for the machine or not do business.

Of late however a cloud has appeared on the horizon of the Land O Graft and its shadow is weighing heavy on the heart of the grafters. It is only a modest sized cloud but it is growing with wonderful rapidity. Two years ago it could not be located with a telescope, last year it was no larger than a man's hand but now no one can tell how large it really is. Some say that it is only the shadow of the statehood agitation which is being carried on, but the wise know better. Statehood has been a feature in Indian Territory and Oklahoma politics for some years. It has made a splendid issue and a safe one, for of course the Territories are too serviceable to the Washington politicians as a place to put hungry pie hunters to be handed over to the people for self-government. Statehood has occupied the minds of the

residents and kept them out of mischief while the Territories have served as a political dumping ground for the administration.

About three years ago the omnipresent Socialist agitator made his appearance in the Territories and the cloud had its beginning. He found most fertile ground for the seeds of discontent he sowed and so the little cloud grew. The white farmer and mechanic in Indian Territory is disfranchised and not having a vote soon lost his hereditary political bias. Harassed and disgusted with the exactions of the grafters he is willing to consider any proposition that promises relief and proved a ready and willing convert to the principles of Socialism. The Indian free from political prejudices, sullen and resentful under the wrongs he endures, finds in the teachings of Socialism, not a political theory, but in its statement of the common ownership of the land and machinery of earth, a glimmer of the old tribal fraternalism, and while he will possibly never digest Marx, he is embracing Socialism with fervor.

The Socialist Party in Oklahoma and Indian Territory have a joint organization that is already measuring strength with the machine of the grafters and is not being worsted in the test. An able and efficient Secretary and Organizer are regularly employed to direct the work of the party, and if results in growth are to be taken as a criterion they must be directing it very effectively. Many able speakers are constantly touring the Territories and an unbelievable quantity of propaganda literature, books, papers and magazines are being placed in the hands of the people.

In Muskogee this summer the Socialist women and wives of Trade Unionists erected a beautiful Labor Temple, a most striking example of the latent possibilities of the women of the working class. Coalgate, a city of ten thousand, has had a Socialist mayor for some time; Durant, a city of equal size, only escaped by a margin of forty votes and the Republicans, Democrats, Populists, and Prohibitionists all fused in order to make that showing.

All over the Coal-mining regions the Miners Union and the Socialist Club is practically one organization (Gompers notwithstanding). The Farmers' Union with a membership of 125,000 is educating the tillers of the soil, not alone in marketing their crops but in the intelligent use of their ballot as well and the Farmers' Union is largely dominated by its Socialist members.

So great has been the growth of Socialism in Indian Territory and Oklahoma that the grafters and politicians find themselves between the horns of a dilemma. Statehood means that sad inroads will be made upon their preserves, and that grafting will be no more profitable than in any other state. Statehood delayed means continued graft, but it also means the continued growth

of Socialism and the fact that in a few years the Socialist will not only force statehood, but write constitution as well, and with the initiative and referendum and imperative mandate as the basic law make political corruption and grafting forever impossible.

Which horn will be grasped none can say and the only straws which show which way the wind blows is the reports of the action of Congress on the Statehood bill. But whether it shall be statehood or no statehood the question is not being decided in the Halls of Congress as many fondly imagine. The flights of oratory indulged in there is only by-play to amuse the populace and keep them from asking disturbing questions. Statehood or no Statehood is being settled in Indian Territory and Congress will only carry out instructions. The unthinking element which says, "Let us graft to-day, for to-morrow we may die" is strong, but the conservative element which says, "A half a loaf of graft is better than no graft at all" has strength too. Behind closed doors in the Privy Councils of the Land O Graft the question is being hotly debated and the citizens of both Territories are watching with eager interest to see what the decision will be. The great railroad corporations have not yet decided how the representation shall be divided, but as soon as that has been decided and the conservative element in Grafterdom has won, Statehood will come and with it the last scene in the drama of the American Indian. Restrictions will be removed, millions will be made in land speculation, Lo will finally be separated from the soil. No longer will he be landlord to white tenants. With his tribal organization destroyed, his blood impoverished by his Christian brother's "fire water," and long idleness from his accustomed labors in the cause, demoralized, expropriated, helpless, the inebriate asylum, the penitentiary and the insane asylum will be his refuge, the natural destination of incompetents. The Cherokee, the Choctaw, the Creek, the Seminole and Chickisaw tribes will live only as a tradition in the memories of old men. The white man will have unloaded his burden.

KATE RICHARD O'HARE.

A Pioneer of Proletarian Science.

TO LAY bare the historical roots of Marxism means to uncover the rootless theories of those who claim to have outgrown it. The furies of private interest, who are stirred by every discussion of the question of private property, are responsible, on the field of economic science, for a spectacle which would be impossible on any other scientific field. A professor of natural history, who would revert from Darwin's theory of natural development to Cuvier's catastrophic theory, would be met by universal ridicule. But a man who turns back from Marx to Adam Smith or Kant is deemed as worthy of laurels in advance of the fray as a general who takes the field against the Chinese boxers. And yet all the confusion which poses nowadays as brand-new wisdom has been sifted and cleared as long ago as the forties of the nineteenth century by Marx and Engels. "No matter how many phantastic dummies' of *orthodox Marxists* are put to the sword, in fortunately bloodless encounters, for the enjoyment of patriots and philistines, the field is ultimately held by the only *orthodox Marxist* that ever was, namely, the historical course of things."

Thus wrote Franz Mehring in the summer of 1901, in his preface to his edition of the "Posthumous Writings of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels." But a little more than four years of capitalist development have demonstrated that he had too good an opinion of bourgeois science. For in the meantime we have seen official spokesmen in capitalist universities repudiating the Darwinian theories and reverting to the Mosaic theories of creation, without encountering either great ridicule or strong opposition. We have seen theological dabblers in natural science openly supported or seriously discussed by "great authorities" in natural science. We have seen metaphysics and theology fastening themselves like a plague upon science and trying to revive the golden age of medieval scholasticism. And yet all this is but another proof that the historical course of things upholds the theories of Marx and Engels. Official bourgeois science, like all bourgeois intelligence, is on its declining curve, because the industrial basis of capitalism is disintegrating.

So much more does the revolutionary proletariat feel the need of a reliable science and realize that science from the point of view of the proletariat, proletarian science, is the only safe-

guard of its historical interests. The defenders and lovers of capitalism may resign themselves to their adulterated science as they do to their adulterated food, and pretend to regard these things as divine retributions for their awful sins, while they persuade themselves that it pays them to do so. But by the same token the proletarian will not be so meek. Wherever official science recoils from its own logical conclusions, there the revolutionary proletariat will call for volunteers to follow up the thread of scientific investigation until they find the undisguished truth. For only the full truth can make us free. Whenever the ruling class shall attempt to drag any truth upon the scaffold, she will find a revolutionary working man ready to die in her defense.

Under these circumstances it is high time that the American socialist movement should acquaint itself with the first scientific socialist who sprang to the side of Marx and Engels when they flung the gage of battle into the teeth of bourgeois political economists and historians, the man who "sifted and cleared all the confusion which nowadays poses as brand-new wisdom" in philosophy and natural science, just as Marx and Engels did in their own special fields.

This man was Joseph Dietzgen. Born in 1828, he was but twenty years old (ten years younger than Marx) when the "Communist Manifesto" made a socialist of him and drove him out on the street to make socialist speeches. At 21, the victory of the Central European reaction served to improve his education by driving him to the United States. Two years later he returned to Germany and resumed his father's trade, the tanning business, at the same time spending all his leisure in the study of history and philosophy. In 1853, he married. At the age of thirty-one, we find him once more in the United States, trying his luck at storekeeping in Montgomery, Alabama. But his advanced views on the slave question irritated the good southern church people, who compelled the "ignorant foreigner" to flee for his life, in 1861.

He passed the greater part of the following twenty-three years in Germany, except a period of about five years, during which he superintended a government tannery in St. Petersburg, Russia. In all these years, he devoted as much time to study as he could spare from the struggle for existence.

Just as he had been one of the first to respond to the call of the "Communist Manifesto", so he was one of the first to greet with enthusiasm the publication of the first volume of Marx's "Capital." It was especially the philosophical element in the Marxian theories which appealed to him, and nearly all the articles which he wrote for the struggling socialist papers

of that day are permeated by the breath of a growing scientific philosophy. In these articles we find an answer to all the specious and shallow assertions which still pass in certain circles for an evidence of great learning.

It was but natural that Dietzgen should feel himself attracted by Ludwig Feuerbach even more than Marx and Engels were, and that he remained to the end a close friend of the author of the "Essence of Christianity."

The first great work of Dietzgen matured in 1869, two years after the publication of the first volume of Marx's "Capital" and two years before the death of Feuerbach. It was written in St. Petersburg and bore the title, "The Nature of Human Brain Work." Dietzgen took issue in this book with Kant and Hegel, and vindicated the materialist conception of history by demonstrating that the human faculty of thought is itself a material product, not a supernatural entity. At the same time, this line of research led him to develop the Marxian method beyond Marx and the field of human society into a natural and cosmic theory of human understanding.

Marx and Engels were quick in recognizing the genius of the young tanner, who, although economically of the middle class, was nevertheless, like themselves, a proletarian by intellectual adoption. Marx in his preface to "Capital", and Engels in his "Feuerbach," have acclaimed Dietzgen as their independent and equal co-worker. At the international socialist congress at The Hague, in 1872, Marx introduced him to the assembled delegates with the words: "Here is our philosopher."

The fury of the Bismarckian reaction, in 1878, struck also this proletarian philosopher. But it did not prevent him from continuing his contributions to the underground socialist press and his studies. His children had grown up in the meantime, and when his son Eugene emigrated to the United States, in 1880, in order to prepare a home in that country for the Dietzgen family, our philosopher devoted himself to the philosophical education of this son by a series of letters on logic, which showed that the man was marching undauntedly forward on the trail which he had begun to blaze in his younger years. When he followed his son to the United States in 1884, setting foot on this country for the third time, he at once took an active part in the socialist movement of that period by editing first the New York party organ, *Der Sozialist*, and later, after removing to Chicago, by taking charge of the *Arbeiterzeitung* just when the capitalist storm was wreaking vengeance on the communist anarchists of that city.

His maturest work, written in 1887, one year before his sudden death, is the "Positive Outcome of Philosophy," in which he

perfected his naturalist dialectics into a consistent natural monism.

The scattered contributions of Joseph Dietzgen to the literature of the socialist movement have been carefully collected by his son Eugene, and the first volume of an English edition will soon be published by Charles H. Kerr & Company, Chicago. A second volume will follow in the not distant future.

The first volume opens with a sketch of Joseph Dietzgen's life, by his son Eugene Dietzgen, who also contributes an illustration of the proletarian method of study and world-conception, in an essay entitled "Max Stirner and Joseph Dietzgen." This is followed by a collection of some of the most important articles written by Joseph Dietzgen during the early stages of the German socialist movement for some of the first German socialist papers. In the article on "Scientific Socialism," Dietzgen gives a philosophical explanation of the principles of scientific socialism. In his six sermons on "The Religion of Social-Democracy" he shows that morality is based on common needs and that standards of ethics change with changes in the material conditions of peoples. The next essay, on "Social-Democratic Philosophy" demonstrates that human salvation depends on material work, not on theological moonshine, and that socialists, therefore, look for salvation not so much to religious and ethical preaching as to the organic growth of social development. In "The Limits of Cognition," "Our Professors on the Limits of Cognition," and "The Inconceivable," he draws the veil from the contradictory and immature notions of official theology and science concerning the nature of the human faculty of thought, and shows that this faculty has only natural, not supernatural, limits. In the "Excursions of a Socialist into the Domain of Epistemology," he takes issue with the bourgeois Darwinians and belated followers of 18th century materialism, and shows that even the most advanced scientific materialist of the bourgeoisie, Haeckel, fails to apply his scientific method uniformly (or monistically). Especially the chapter on "Materialism versus Materialism," in which he sets forth the difference between proletarian monism and bourgeois materialism, and that on "Darwin and Hegel," in which he compares the relative merits of these two thinkers in the formulation of a scientific theory of evolution, are very valuable and should serve as eyeopeners, particularly for those who fancy that they have refuted the scientific naturalism of the modern proletariat when they have delivered themselves of a few commonplaces against the bourgeois conception of materialism.

The socialist movement has hitherto given almost exclusive recognition to Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. It will gradually learn to appreciate also Joseph Dietzgen and give him his

just dues. Karl Marx was the first to formulate in a general way the theory of historical materialism and to apply Darwinian principles to society by culling the natural kernel from the mystic shell of Hegelian evolution. Dietzgen proved the correctness of this general theory by demonstrating beyond peradventure the material origin and nature of the faculty of thought, thereby completing the explanation given of this faculty by modern biological psychology, and applying the very ultimate conclusions of his discovery with unfaltering consistency.

It is this discovery of Dietzgen's which gives the death, blow to all metaphysical and dualistic thought. Once that we have grasped the import of his work, we are armored against all attacks of reactionary speculation.

Thanks to Joseph Dietzgen, we can apply the historical materialism of Marx with perfect understanding and with a conviction of its irrefutable truth. A proletarian armed with the intellectual weapons of Darwin's natural selection theory, Marx's historical materialism, and Dietzgen's theory of understanding, can approach every phenomenon in society and nature with scientific objectiveness and precision.

And if the spokesmen of modern bourgeois philosophy prate learnedly of the *Passing of Materialism*, and if some bourgeois parrots in the socialist movement echo their glittering generalities, with an air of pronouncing the latest scientific truths, it is due to the work of these three revolutionary thinkers that we are enabled to reply: "Speak for yourselves! We know your tune, and we also know why you are singing it. There was a time when you used to sing another tune, which you called the *Passing of Socialism*. Now that the facts have proved your ignorance of social development, you have taken up the new tune of the *Passing of Materialism*. This tune is true enough so far as you and your class are concerned. Among you, the passing of materialism, that is to say, the passing of an uncompromising adherence to scientific induction and experiment, is but a reflex in your mind of the *Passing of Capitalism*. But scientific materialism has found a strong and young champion in the rising proletariat, and the *Coming of Socialism* means the *Coming of Scientific Materialism* and the *Passing of dualistic Theology and Metaphysics*."

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

An Example of Strength.

IN a recent number of this REVIEW the writer made a statement that perhaps appeared as an exaggeration. It was said that the Bohemians in Europe have a grand socialistic movement. Little is known of the Bohemian nation in America, even among the socialists, and it is therefore but natural that still less is known of the Bohemian socialistic movement. And yet the organization of class-conscious proletarians among the Bohemians is relatively as strong, if not stronger than that of any other nation. As an example of this strength the statistics of one single election-district (*Wahlbezirk*) may be cited. Of course, I mean one of the districts of the fifth curia. The curiat-system still exists in Austria, and Bohemia has 18 districts of the fifth curia where the working-class has the right of suffrage.

During the 6th and 7th of January the socialistic organizations of the 2nd election-district of Bohemia held their annual-conference in the small town of Krocehlavy. This district is usually known under the name of Kladno, a great industrial center near Prague, the capital of Bohemia. But it comprises also quite a number of agricultural counties. It is simply a sample of the skillful election geometry of the Austrian government, which, trying to check the growing power of Social Democracy, always combined the reactionary agricultural districts with industrial centers into one election-district in such a manner that the agrarian element outnumbered the industrial workers, for the time being at least. But the conference just mentioned proved that the policy of the Austrian government in the long run must meet with a failure. Even the rural districts cannot resist the educational propaganda of Socialism.

The social Democrats of Kladno, seeing that they must organize the agricultural workingmen if they are to meet with any degree of success at all, went to work and carried on a campaign of education among the ignorant workers of their district, and the results of their work speak for themselves, commanding the admiration of every socialist. The fruits of this labor are embodied in an annual report submitted to the conference in Krocehlavy. Our party organ of Kladno, *Kladno*, says of the conference: "A human pen hardly can picture the grandness of the conference of the second election-district of Bohemia. This was not a mere conference, it was a great demonstration. A

demonstration of our greatness and our strength. A demonstration of the red second district—a demonstration of the reddest and most important district of the Bohemian Social Democracy. It was a triumphant conference.”

These words are no hollow phrases, no foolish self-praise. The Social Democrats of the second district of Bohemia are justified in using such terms. The work they have done within the space of a few years is of such a nature that it can serve as an example even to us, the Socialists of America.

According to the report submitted to the conference the Social Democrats have an organization in 195 communities of the district. And since the district has in all but 208 communities and towns, only thirteen unorganized municipalities remain. Politically, 11,371 men and 1,170 women are organized. This gives us a total of 12,541 organized persons in a population of about 350,000.

Our comrades in Europe, whenever possible, organize also turners' societies. This district has sixteen of these societies with 824 men, and 26 women.

In speaking of the organization of the working classes we cannot overlook the trade union organization which in Europe, especially in Bohemia, is closely connected with the socialistic movement. The figures for the second district of Bohemia are as follows: 12,040 men, and 376 women. The so-called all-union organizations (comprising a membership of different trades), educational and mutual benefit societies, all socialistic, have a membership of 4,352 men, and 175 women.

Workingmen's co-operative concerns also deserve to be mentioned. There are eight of them with a membership amounting to 1,452.

In those thirteen communities where the Social Democrats have no political organization they have educational societies so that in fact the whole district is in their hands.

The socialists of the district have their representatives in a number of city and town councils. Altogether they have in this single district 109 aldermen. It may also be said that lately quite a number of aldermen and even heads of the different communities are beginning to join the socialists' organization, although originally they were not elected on the socialist platform. Of course, our comrades are mighty careful in admitting these people into the organization. No mere office-seekers are allowed to come into the party.

The unceasing educational campaign and merciless warfare waged on capitalism is also apparent in the following figures: The comrades of the district have held 93 open air meetings (6 forbidden by the authorities), 402 public meetings (20 forbid-

den), 1,354 organization and business meetings, 484 lectures. This gives us a total of 2,333 within one year.

The circulation of socialistic literature, especially of party organs, is also relatively enormous. The figures are as follows: *Právo Lidu*, the Bohemian socialist daily of Prague, has only among organized socialists of the district a circulation of 5,232 copies on week days; on Sundays the number of copies bought by members of the party amounts to 7,581; *Zar*, a weekly, sold at the price of one kreutzer, boasts of a circulation of 9,099 copies; the district organ, *Svoboda* has a circulation of 3,174 copies. All these papers are owned and published by the party. They are political. But the Bohemian Social Democrats publish also a number of papers devoted to science, literature and art. *Rudé Kvety*, a monthly for art and literature, has 438 subscribers among the members of the organization. *Akademie*, a scientific review, resembling the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, shows a circulation of 71 copies. *Zensky List*, published exclusively for education of women, has 351 subscribers: *Sborník Mládeže*, devoted to propaganda among young workingmen, shows a circulation of 668 copies. These are only a few of the party organs circulated in a single Bohemian district. I may also state that the *Delnické Listy*, a Bohemian socialist daily of Vienna, *Nová Doba*, a bi-weekly, published in Pilsen, *Rasple*, a satirical monthly, *Cervánky*, a weekly for popularization of science, and trade union journals have a combined circulation of 11,668 copies. In reading these figures we must bear in mind, I repeat, that they pertain only to organized members of the party. It is, therefore, but natural to presume that the real circulation of our party press greatly exceeds the given numbers.

The figures we have just cited deserve our attention in many respects. Consider, for instance, the number of workingmen organized politically and the number of those organized in trade unions. The given figures are nearly identical; this is significant as it shows that almost all trade unionists of the district are members of the political organization. That is certainly a remarkable evidence of class-consciousness; it also tends to show the sound and healthy basis of the Bohemian working-class movement.

Also very interesting are the figures relating to the circulation of socialistic papers. We can readily see that every member of the organization is either a subscriber for the socialist daily of Prague, or the district party organ. The workingmen even give preference to the daily, although the subscription is higher than for the district organ which is published thrice a week. It is evident that the Bohemian workingmen are aware of the importance of a party press.

These figures, showing the strength of organization in one single election district, certainly fully substantiate the statement that the Bohemian socialists have a grand movement. It is only natural that a movement of such strength and vitality protests against a scheme that would deprive it of the right of representation in the International.

CHARLES PERGLER.

Why We Don't Win.

WHAT socialism should have ceased so suddenly to be a subject for jest in our daily newspapers and have lately become a matter of serious though often hysterical discussion in them, and that the socialist vote in the United States should have been multiplied by four in the last four years excites the wonder of some. But consider how economic interest works with the socialists agitator; and the wonder is that our vote grows so slowly, not that it grows so fast. It is said there is plenty of employment now under fair conditions for all able and willing to work. Those who find it comfortable to think so will not be convinced of the contrary. But let us examine what limits employment in business for profit, and then look for some of the counter-acting influences strong enough to make our growth so slow in spite of this.

Change of the tools of production into machines owned by capitalists has brought consequences much more far reaching than the cheapening of things. Since no man can produce all his own necessities, even if he lives in the poorest way, every worker must produce things for sale in the market, or take some share in the community's industries so as to receive in exchange the things he must have to live. The introduction of an improved machine makes his product so cheap that, without this machine, he cannot produce it for the price and live. It becomes impossible for an individual worker to own and operate more and more of this machinery separately; because increasing complexity increases the cost of the machine, and because it is now no longer operated as a separate machine but as a part of a system of machinery in a factory, for which the co-operation of a large number of trained and disciplined workers is necessary. Consequently the occupations of the home and of the individual have been mostly taken into the factory. The individual can continue in his employment only as a wage worker and only so long as it is profitable to his employer. Thus the coming into use of improved machinery has strengthened the control of the capitalist class and extended it over almost all occupations, a consequence of supreme importance; and at the same time employment in all industries in which their money is invested depends upon the sale of the product at a profitable price, that is a price greater than all the wages paid to all those who have helped in any way, whatsoever to produce it.

Therefore the workers must be too poor to buy that which is the product of their own labor. The great quantity of that which their wages cannot buy is vastly more than the capitalists can consume. The surplus of it has heretofore been used to feed and clothe workers employed in building new machinery and developing new resources for production in which the money of our capitalists has been invested. However, good investments are becoming more and more difficult to find; because the organization of business in staple industries is already established, and not only is sufficient modern machinery already built, but production with it is already stifled to an alarming degree by the impossibility of selling the product at a profit. As this commercial and industrial development of our country reaches completion, continued production under the profit system becomes more and more dependent upon a continuously expanding foreign market in which to sell the goods the workers make but cannot buy. But improved machinery is promptly introduced where our goods are sold, so that these nations also become manufacturers with the machine, competing with us fiercely to sell in the still smaller remaining foreign market, the goods their workers are likewise too poor to buy. For the very reason for which it was made; namely, the saving of labor, improved machinery under private ownership makes employment impossible for an increasing number of the workers, because, under the profit system, the sale and consumption of goods cannot increase like the tremendous increase in the quantity we produce with the same labor. The constant presence and intense competition of many workers anxiously seeking employment reduces all workers to an average wage of bare living. These facts are commonplace, and this conclusion the workers ought to be able to see. In every conceivable way it is demonstrated again and again by socialist editors and agitators. Why does it not meet with more prompt recognition by most wage workers?

No change that does not cut off the unearned incomes of the rich can raise the pay of labor to the price of its own product. No change that does not take away the control of our occupations from the capitalists, so that production cannot be limited any longer by the chances of profits for them, can reduce this furious competition among the workers for insufficient opportunities of employment under present intolerable conditions. To any such change, benefiting the workers at the expense of their unearned incomes, the interest of the capitalist class is absolutely and unalterably opposed. Yet millions of working men vote for capitalist parties whose record and avowed policy get them the money and the votes of the rich also. As this conflict of interests grows more and more conspicuous, it is puzzling to think why men do so while their wives must haggle over the price of pork, and borrow to help

the week's wage cover every small unusual expense, and while the birth of another child to them is a positive misfortune. What influences are so strong against us? Are we working along the lines of least resistance to our purpose so as not to arouse needlessly the opposition of inbred popular prejudices? We cannot conclude that our fellow worker, who is often superior in the skill and knowledge necessary for his work, is so dull or indifferent to his own interests. As all forces are measured by their effects, there must be adequate influences to account for his acting so, though he will not explain them.

The average wage worker is convinced already of the corruption of our politics and the injustice of our business life. Denunciation can hardly increase his discontent. He is not expecting to be an employer himself some day either. But what does he think of the industrial system of socialism? And what changes in our social relations and in our laws does he believe the program of the Socialist Party will involve? Especially if he cannot tell how he absorbed such impressions, he thinks that collective ownership of all property and prohibitive laws against private property and private enterprise are intended, and moreover compulsory government employment with arbitrarily enforced equality, equality of pay for all kinds of labor. He considers the consequent great increase in the powers of the state and the loss of rights and liberties by the individual. He contemplates the loss of all sense of personal independence and personal responsibility which must result and the consequent certain decline in incentive to labor and individual progress, on which all other progress depends. "Don't socialists demand the abolition of the system of competition and private ownership?" he asks. Such a state Herbert Spencer called "The Coming Slavery." To it the present condition were far preferable. These communistic and utopian conceptions are entirely inconsistent with all official declarations of modern socialism. They are in conflict with the official declarations of the Socialist Party now. But our official declarations are repeatedly misinterpreted and misapplied by socialists themselves. These conceptions of socialism, false and grotesque as they are, yet widely prevalent and deeply rooted in the public opinion, are probably the most powerful influences we have to contend with. By encouraging them or by leaving any basis for them the greatest obstacles are raised, obstacles which we must overcome before industrial democracy can be set in order and its inestimable benefits realized.

Some do maintain that competition will be abolished by socialism and the pay for all kinds of labor will be arbitrarily made the same. The thing can't be done. We are in no danger that it will ever be tried. But great discredit is brought upon the socialist

organization by tolerating the popular impression that anything of the sort has ever been its intention. Capitalism is surely leveling us into the equality of poverty and the apathy of slaves. Therefore capitalists can hardly charge that socialism will destroy the incentive to progress. But unless socialism will reward industry and foresight better than it will laziness and apathy, it is plain enough that it must plead guilty to this charge, though its advocates avoid admitting this by dodging the plain question. And plain questions are dodged by giving long and involved replies instead of straight forward answers, or by saying that, not being prophets, we propose to leave settlement of these minor details to the society of the future. As it is known that a multitude of words is frequently used to conceal thought, the questioner is entirely justified in thinking this is the purpose of the involved answer, and that the disavowal of prophetic power is a plain evasion, both of which have been resorted to to conceal inability to answer a reasonable objection. It is passing strange that many representative socialists, who have well earned the right to speak for socialism, permit misrepresentation of our aim in such important particulars. It is disappointing and disheartening that socialist speakers and editors are so often confused and doubtful in applying socialist economics to the analysis of these important and oft-repeated objections. It is the more striking by contrast, because they are so clear and forceful elsewhere. The position taken by the Socialist Party in its official declarations is unassailable.

But energetic ingenuity answers a thousand curious questions with as many fancy notions of its own. It is even said positively, for instance, that under socialism money will be abolished. It remains to be seen. There is no official declaration yet on this subject. By money we mean the commodity, or the paper or coin that passes in place of that commodity, which is in use as the standard of value sought in exchange for all other commodities. Its value is adjusted by the action of supply and demand to correspond pretty closely to the amount of labor it represents. Money is therefore a very useful convenience for exchange, though imperfect now; and it seems probable it will be used for an indefinite time in the future, whether we call the circulating paper money or labor checks or what not.

We are not communists. "From each according to his ability, and to each according to his need," is the law which rules, so far as capitalism permits, within the sacred bounds of home and family. The law of heaven hath not been conceived to be more sweet and noble than this. And the community that could order its life upon this law alone would need no visions of golden streets and hosts singing to harps to make its picture heavenly. A consciousness of common needs and a common dependence develops

a sense of a mutual obligation within the family. But the social conscience is not awakened yet that will some day teach us the brotherhood of man in fact, that there is among all men a like mutual dependence and common interest to that which binds together the sons and daughters of one mother. That social conscience can never live even where it is aroused under the conditions of the present commercial cannibalism. And before it is even awakened, to suggest that in business every man shall take what he needs and do what he pleases under such a free and easy law as this would be in the highest degree absurd.

Demand for the "collective ownership of all the means of production and distribution" has been omitted fortunately from our last national platform. It must have been taken to mean the collective ownership of all the means of production from a pair of scissors to a steam hammer or a bonanza farm, which never was intended. Private ownership of the means of *social* production and distribution in our great organized industries gives power to tax the purchasing public for private profit. This is alone enough to compel the common ownership by the people of all things on which we in common depend. However the socialist movement preceeded and anticipated the appearance of trusts. And it was for an entirely different reason the collective ownership of the means of production and distribution was long before demanded. The essential purpose of capitalism is the private ownership of tools and land, not to work with them, but to get an income, beside the return of the value of the tools and materials consumed, from the labor of those who do work with them. And this is done as well by owning the small tools and land used by the individual as by owning the great social tool of production. Since there is no right to private property which does not depend upon the right to it first of the producer: so far from attacking private property or seeking to abolish it, we socialists stand alone in consistent defense of private property. The legalized system of capitalist confiscation of the workers' product makes it more and more difficult for those who produce all private property to own any but a few old pots and cans, some shabby furniture, and old clothes. Only the opportunity of employment in industries publicly organized to pay the whole income to those who do the work can relieve the worker from the extortion of the capitalist. But this does not involve the collective ownership of all the means of production, nor make laws necessary which shall prohibit private enterprise or private ownership even of means of production. When it becomes unprofitable, however, private ownership of the means of co-operative production will fall into "innocuous dissuetude." To abolish the system of getting something for nothing by the private ownership of the tools,

socialists intend "that the tools of employment shall belong to their creators and users." Those things on which we in common depend, with which we can work only in co-operation, we can therefore own only as we use them, that is, collectively. What has this got to do with abolishing competition? So far from abolishing competition, it is the only escape from the present private monopolies by which competition is already abolished in the sale of many public necessities.

In its first stages capitalism seemed to justify itself by giving the management of industry to the provident and far seeing, who are always a minority, usually an unpopular minority. Profits have sometimes been little more than the reward of wise forethought and good management. But the incomes of large corporations are paid, at the expense of those whose labor and wise management make them, in dividends to investors who need not concern themselves about anything that tends to progress or public welfare. And this is the essential purpose of capitalism developed to its perfection. By it industry, enterprise, and ingenuity are cut off from hope of their reward. Here is paternalism and the destruction of the incentive in fact.

The purpose that unites us is to secure all the benefits of labor to those who labor. By the same reasoning, each should receive a share the same as his share of the labor. The complexity of the problem of distributing the product persuades many that socialism is impracticable. Capitalism is breaking down utterly in its failure to solve it. And this is the very problem which socialism must solve, for the chief cause of discontent with the present system is monstrous injustice in the division of the products of labor. Surely then we can reasonably be asked how we expect to solve this problem now. Its importance we cannot minimize. But the subject is one of such complexity that no concise declaration has been made to contain completely and accurately the conclusions established by studying it. There is no official declaration by the Socialist Party regarding any proposed change from the usual method of determining the relative pay for different kinds of work now. The worker cannot be given the full value of his labor as a price in his hand. All workers must necessarily help to pay for the improvements in the machinery of production of which each will own an equal share and have an equal benefit. Provision for insurance, sickness, and old age may further reduce his immediate share below the full value of his own labor. But in the benefits of these he would share as he would in the burdens. To determine the relative value to the community of different kinds of work, the free action of supply and demand will be the best if not the only method. But there is no official declaration on this subject, and no individual has the

right to make any declaration claiming for it the authority of the Socialist Party.

Management of the organized, co-operative industries must be the common concern of all, since each in equal degree is dependent upon them just as upon the preservation of order and the protection of life and property by the law. A democratic system of control of industry by representatives responsible to the people is the only possible conclusion to socialist philosophy and is entirely in accord with the theory of our national institutions. It is objected that socialism would greatly increase the opportunities for political corruption, which is now cynically regarded as "a necessary evil." And it is greatly doubted that democratic institutions can withstand the destructive influences of graft. As our industrial feudalism rises, the political republic wanes. This big honest doubt must be reckoned one of the strong influences that hinders the growth of the Socialist Party. "The socialists would be grafters just like the others," they say. But socialists have always contended that a political republic can be nothing but a farce in a nation of industrial dependents. More than usual has happened lately to fix public attention upon the fact that it is our corrupt business system that infects our political life. Only the large capitalist with large business interests at stake, affected by the law, has the money and the motive to bribe public officers. Though there are frequent scandals in the government service, generally to be traced to that kind of enterprise called "business," there is this advantage in favor of government service; viz., what is graft and crime in the conduct of the post office or the war department is merely profit and shrewd business in the management of a corporation. Should a public officer use his control of the post office to enrich himself at our expense, it is a crime for which he can be sent to prison. But those who manage our railroads are not expected to do anything else, and their success in it is admired as fine business sagacity. And it remains for us to perfect our so called democratic institutions so as to get for the people the same power over their public employees that the private employer has over his employee; namely, to do what he leaves undone, to undo what he does wrong, and to dismiss him promptly with or without any reason assigned. This purpose is comprehended in the planks of our platform advocating direct legislation and the right of recall of representatives.

In the estimation of the public socialists are enemies of religion. And this too weighs heavily against the power of persuasion we otherwise exert. Of course the declaration and principles which bind the socialist organization together have no relation whatever to purely religious subjects. They are entirely in accord with the ethics of Christianity, however. But to condemn the

whole present system of business absolutely and without qualification as founded in iniquity and thoroughly immoral is, by perfectly obvious implication, to condemn the policy of the religious institutions which gladly accept its bounty. It is to brand as false any moral teaching that is distorted into toleration of successful business. This world and its business is anti-christian; but it is now being conducted by professed Christians with the tacit approval of the church. For this reason the bonds of orthodoxy rest lightly, if at all, upon the thorough-going socialist. So far as religion itself is concerned, we are at least as much interested to know and earnest to honor the truth that may be revealed of man's present responsibilities and future part in the plan of the universe as others who are more careless of their responsibilities as citizens.

Again many people are frightened by the absolutely defiant attitude of the socialists, their cry no quarter, no compromise, in this irrespressible conflict of human rights against the so-called rights of capital. They think that socialists would use the powers of government for wild experiments and for vengeful and disastrous attacks upon the business corporations without any provision to replace them. The fear of "confiscation" and the upsetting of things in consequence keeps many voting against socialism. Little do they realize that the process of confiscation is already pretty well along, and that the longer they delay restitution of their own to the people the more surely will it have to be done by sweeping changes. They are preparing for themselves the very thing they dread, and the socialists alone would save them from it. The mob, riot, and confusion make up the picture most people have of a socialist triumph. In the many municipalities administered by socialists in Europe no incidents have been found by industrious capitalist hirelings with which they could make this picture real. The police and the powers of government seem to have been used to maintain order and enforce the law.

All these objections and misconceptions yield slowly to argument and a better understanding. And as the growing industrial despotism now unfolds itself, it becomes apparent that every dire evil that can be suggested as a danger possible in an industrial democracy is an actual and ineradicable condition of the continued rule of plutocracy. But answers to these questions and objections cannot be dismissed as worthless speculations merely because they do not actually determine how these problems will be settled. The questions are not asked about the indefinitely distant future. They demand what solution we propose for these problems now. And the answers must convince that we are fully well prepared to deal successfully now with the difficulties they present. They are of the highest importance; because to get the

support we must have, we must answer these objections in a conclusive and satisfactory manner. Communistic theories and utopian schemes are utterly worthless in dealing with them. The hard, exact, economic science which is the structure of modern socialism is being differentiated clearly from these dreams. And the socialist editors and speakers who will mark the difference, and who, in answering objections and questions, will hold always consistently to the official declarations of the party and to the principles on which Marx made his analysis of capitalist production will greatly increase the effectiveness of their work and the prestige and dignity of the socialist organization.

New York, July, 1905.

WARREN ATKINSON.

EDITORIAL

An Exhibition of Solidarity.

The one redeeming feature in the midst of the terrible tragedy which is now being attempted in Idaho is the manner in which it has solidified the working class of America. Literally thousands of protest meetings have been held in every portion of the country. The Socialist Party, the I. W. W. and several trade unions have responded with appeals to their membership. Another suggestive phase of the question has been the response of the socialist press. The *Appeal to Reason*, *Wilshires Magazine*, and the *Socialist* of Toledo all have special correspondents on the field and are preparing to give wide publicity to the facts in the case. Under the continuous pounding of the Socialist Press and personal pressure, Hearst has at last been forced to act and is now using all of his powers of publicity in defense of the miners.

But great as have been the protests so far there has been no sign of weakening on the part of the murderous conspiracy. It must also be remembered that all of this educational work which is being done by the socialist press does not reach the locality from which the jury will be drawn. In a private letter from Comrade Jos. Wanhope, who is representing Wilshire, he tells us:

"Recollect there is no industry here in the wage sense of the question. All this southern part of the state is agricultural and pastoral, the business element being the controlling element, hostile to the prisoners, and influencing the agriculturalists in that direction also. With this community Steunenberg was the whole thing—'best governor Idaho ever had'—genial, kindly and lovable 'Hero martyr', etc., etc. It's natural enough of course in a community of this sort, that has no actual connection with the wage-working classes. Coeur D'Alene is three or four hundred miles north and there is no direct railroad connection north and south. The centre of this state is practically uninhabited—most of it government forest reserve, and in this place at least capitalism has full control of public opinion. If you wanted to take a labor agitator to a place where you could murder him without local protest, no better spot in the country could be found than this region of Southern Idaho.

Coeur D'Alene is coerced and terrorized. The real reason for the arrest of Vincent St. John is that he was secretly organizing the workers there and was having so much success that the capitalists simply had to get him out of the district. I don't look for anything very serious to happen to him, but since getting into the atmosphere of this place, I fear more than I did for the other three men."

Under these conditions it must be remembered that eternal activity and agitation is the price of the liberty of our imprisoned comrades. With the coming of warm weather parades and open air meetings should be organized throughout the United States. These will reach a larger number of those who are ignorant of the facts than the in-door meetings. More important still is the necessity of increasing the strength of the Socialist Party organization and the vote for its candidates. If it can be directly proven that the prosecution of these men is causing a rapid and continuous rise of the socialist vote throughout the country we shall soon see that prosecution cease.

Since the lives of these men depend to a large extent upon the degree of united protest on the part of the workers and the solidified front which they present to this act of aggression, any attempt to divide the forces of the workers at this time merits severest condemnation. It is a time for the sinking of differences of opinion and a closing up of ranks. We regret to notice that in a few places there has been a very evident attempt on the part of both the I. W. W. and the Socialist Party organizations (not to mention the S. L. P.) to utilize the wave of indignation which is spreading among the workers for the benefit of their own organizations even at the expense of the life of our western comrades. This is all the more disreputable in that some of the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor have responded so magnificently to this cause. To use protest meetings, arranged by the United Mine Workers, for example, as a means of furthering I. W. W. interests is contemptible in view of the responses which the United Mine Workers made to the call upon them for assistance.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

, RUSSIA.

From all directions come reports of renewed revolutionary activity and it is generally expected that the first of May will be celebrated by the opening of a general revolt. Rosa Luxemburg, the well known worker in the German Socialist Party, went to Russia some months ago and has been writing the stirring articles which have appeared in the *Vorwaerts*, from that point. During all of this period the German capitalist papers have been taunting her with cowardice, because, as they supposed, she was located in Berlin and was only fighting at long range. Now it appears that for several weeks she had been in a prison in Warsaw and that during the whole period that the German capitalist editors were advising her to show how brave she was by going to Russia and writing her articles there, that she was really doing just that very thing. Should she be executed as has been threatened it would prove a blow to the Russian and German movement, and also to the whole international movement. At the same time, however, it would rouse international agitation and sympathy to a much higher degree than it has ever reached heretofore.

AUSTRIA.

From the *Volkstribüne* of Vienna we learn that the socialists have at last practically attained universal equal suffrage and that they are preparing for the coming election with the certainty of a great increase in the socialist representation in the Reichstag. The great cities under the new apportionment will receive a considerable increase in the number of representatives and they will nearly all be socialists. The law also provides for a measure at least of security against intimidation and the general abuse of the right of suffrage which has existed heretofore. The exact wording of the law is as follows. "Each person of the male sex shall be qualified to vote for representatives who has reached 24 years of age, is an Austrian citizen and is not specifically excluded from the right of suffrage, and who shall have lived at least one year within the community in which he seeks to exercise the rights of suffrage." Some idea of the extent of the change is gained by the fact that under the previous election law, 172 out of 425 representatives were elected by indirect and *viva voce* vote, and that the socialists were absolutely excluded from any voice in the election of these representatives. Furthermore out of these 425 representatives only 22 were elected by universal

suffrage, while now the entire 425 are so elected. The new suffrage law carries with it a new electoral apportionment according to population, which will largely abolish the gerrymandering previously existing. This can not but mean that a very large number of socialists will be elected to parliament at the next election.

ENGLAND.

Elsewhere in this number Comrade Hyndman gives a discussion of the activity of the labor party in parliament. Telegraphic dispatches add that the Taff-Vale decision has been reversed and the funds of trades unions declared inviolate. Another measure for which the labor members are responsible is the proposition for feeding school children. This bids fair to be realized in the near future.

FRANCE.

The parliamentary elections are taking place in France, but we have not as yet been able to obtain any definite information. Comrade Paul Lafargue is running against Millerand and the result of this contest will be of international interest.

BELGIUM.

Some of the Belgian provinces hold their elections for the Chamber of Deputies on the 27th of May. There will probably be an alliance of most of the bourgeois parties against the socialists and nevertheless the latter look for some considerable gains.

RUSSIA.

Lieut. Smith, whose dramatic speech over the grave of the revolutionists was given in these columns in our January number, was recently executed. At his own request his hands were left unbound and the cap was not drawn over his eyes. He stepped bravely to the place of execution turned round to the soldiers and sailors and said: "Farewell! Fire." So great were the demonstrations over his grave and so many the visitors to do him honor that some days after his burial his body was exhumed and he was carried out to sea in order to prevent further marks of honor.

The elections for the Douma have been held, but on the whole were farcical. Whenever a working class representative was nominated and there was any chance of his election he was promptly arrested and sent to Siberia. In other cases the polls were surrounded with Cossacks and those who gave any indication of not voting "right" were treated to a little persuasion in the form of knouts and lances. One of the large working class districts in Russia showed their contempt by literally electing a yellow dog as their representative.

We have just received a personal letter from a correspondent in St.

Petersburg, whose name we can not give at present, but who has enjoyed remarkable opportunities for observation. From this letter we take the following extracts:

"As to the peasant movement, I expect Jacqueries to an extent and of a character which will eclipse all that history has ever seen put together. I think that this will so transform the situation on the whole continent of Europe, and the attitude of the whole world towards the agrarian question, that we will have to give all our social movements and social ideas a new date from then on. This movement is beginning as I write, and two friends whom I brought over here are down in Rostoff at the present moment watching its beginnings. It will spread north with the spring, but may not come to a climax until next fall, and might even commence with redoubled energy a year from date. Longer than two years I do not consider it could last, as the peasants themselves would be too much starved to do anything whatever. That is not the case at the present time.

"The Siberian army is bringing to the villages the will to revolt. Reservists are returning every day and they will all be back by the first of June (15th, Christian style). About this same date about a couple of million of harvest hands are employed on the big properties of the south. These may strike. Also about the same date the peasants will begin to see that the Douma has met and that there is nothing in it. So I should expect a crisis some time in the Russian June.

"The intellectuals in the cities are not and never were in touch and sympathy with the real proletariat. They were perhaps closer to him than in any country in the world, but now that he has got from them about all he wants I think their leadership has gone. In the country it was different. There the intellectuals were formerly separated by a gulf from the peasants. The new period of liberty after the Manifesto, however, drove the intellectuals to an opportunity which they have been awaiting for a generation. They began a hand to hand propaganda among the peasants. This time it was not the revolutionary element among the intellectuals (perhaps some 10 per cent including the much larger proportion of the very young men) but every physician, writer, lawyer, engineer, etc., in the village. Only the prosperous peasants were left to lead the Black Hundreds, as they have always done. Even these prosperous peasants when they see the revolution becoming sufficiently strong are likely to turn to its side, and even to lead it, as their characters are much stronger than those of the intellectuals and they know the peasant better. My point is, however, that the peasants all over Russia have seen in recent months that the intellectuals are willing to stake everything in the fight with them against the landlords and Government.

"The gold reserve is a fake. All Europe now knows it, but all the big European credit institutions are trying to help Russia out until the Douma meets. When the Douma meets and nothing good results the very last card will have been played and Russia will be on a paper basis within a month or two.

"There are absolutely no resources in Russia the government can rely on in this crisis. Even those mentioned by Kautsky in the *Neue Zeit* are fabulous, e. g., if the Church treasure were touched by the government the effect on all true believers would cost the government ten-fold what it would gain. No, there is not the slightest possible ray of financial hope in any possible direction, except if the people can be held down by a mixed policy of cajolery and repression so that foreign confidence is again restored."

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

Organized labor is at last going to enter politics, according to reports from Washington, where the executive council of the American Federation of labor was in session during the past month. At the invitation of the council a hundred or eighty "labor leaders" participated in the conference, and they all marched over in a body to present a memorial to President Roosevelt and Speaker Cannon, of the House, and Frye, of the Senate. Demands were made that the politicians give favorable consideration to the eight-hour and anti-injunction bills, likewise to restriction of Chinese and certain European immigration. "The friends of labor," as usual side-stepped nearly every proposition. True, they made long prayers, but after they were through nobody could tell just what they had said, other than that they could not make the concessions appealed for. President Roosevelt particularly ridiculed the idea of curbing the injunction-throwing judges and introducing the eight-hour system on the Panama canal. He bemoaned the eight-hour system on the sad fact that the employees on the big ditch usually work fairly well Monday and Tuesday, but on Wednesday and Thursday they become lazy or tired, and on Friday and Saturday only about one-quarter of the laborers are at work. Roosevelt did not charge that they are out getting drunk, but that was the inference; and it didn't dawn upon him that, if the hours of labor were shortened to a maximum of eight at the outside in that climate, in all probability the men would be better able to stand the arduous toil. Roosevelt has undoubtedly had little experience in performing hard, manual labor, despite his alleged strenuousness. He inherited a fortune when he was born and ever since he has fought shy of the exacting and exhausting toil that wastes the tissues of the human frame. Of course, Mr. Roosevelt has tramped about with his rifle in his hands looking for bears, coyotes and other game, and he has also looked wise and talked knowingly about frugality, industry, race suicide, etc., but he has not wielded a shovel or pick-ax to any great extent. So it could not be expected that he had any great amount of sympathy for the poor drudges who die in platoons at Panama. On the contrary, "Teddy's" position on this question as well as the anti-injunction bill, which was introduced to curb the powers of capitalistic courts during strikes, showed conclusively that he was a typical and class-conscious capitalist. Frye and Cannon just as plainly demonstrated the fact that they are in the same category and have no interest in labor matters or desire to even consider them. In plain words, the big crowd of "labor leaders" who had been specially summoned to Washington by Gompers were snubbed openly.

What did the "leaders" do? Did they take a firm, uncompromising stand against the capitalistic politicians who had turned them down with little ceremony? Not they. Marshaled by the "Little Napoleon," they hiked back to headquarters on G street, sent for the reporters and talked

at length. It was announced that labor would go into politics — just as if labor had ever been out of politics — and that heads would soon drop into the political basket. Taking as the basis of their campaign to exterminate sundry and certain politician men, the declaration of the A. F. of L. was reaffirmed as follows (printed here for the reason that few people have read it and those who did were unable to guess what it means):

"We reaffirm as one of the cardinal principles of the trade union movement that the working people must unite and organize, irrespective of creed, color, sex, nationality, or politics. That the American Federation of Labor most firmly and unequivocally favors the independent use of the ballot by the trade unionists and workingmen, united regardless of party, that we may elect men from our own ranks to make new laws and administer them along the lines laid down in the legislative demands of the American Federation of Labor and at the same time secure an impartial judiciary that will not govern us by arbitrary injunctions of the court, nor act as the pliant tools of corporate wealth. That as our efforts are centered against all forms of industrial slavery and economic wrong, we must also direct our utmost energies to removing all forms of political servitude and party slavery, to the end that the working people may act as a unit at the polls at every election."

The average workingman who reads the foregoing will probably construe it as meaning that labor should withdraw from all political parties and organize a party of its own, but if you bump into a Republican or Democratic labor leader, so-called, he will quickly inform you that your interpretation is erroneous, and that the meaning of the foregoing is as plain as the nose on your face, viz., that you must act independently in the old parties. That this construction was placed on the above diplomatically worded declaration is further admitted when, after much talk about "independent political action," it was finally decided that "the policy of questioning candidates for office upon questions affecting the interests of labor and the people generally would be continued and more aggressively prosecuted." Thus the mountain labored again and brought forth another mouse. This "questioning of candidates" is a great gag. It was tried two years ago, and we can now see how effectually with every labor bill peacefully sleeping in a pigeonhole, and even present laws, inadequate as they are, entirely ignored or twisted to suit the purpose of the plutocrats in control. Everybody but the innocent labor leaders who got together to admire each other in Washington knows that politicians who are quizzed agree to anything and everything — until they are elected. Or at worst they frame their replies in equivocal and evasive terms, so that all classes of voters will swallow the dope and boost the candidates into office, where they generally do as they please. Scores of places might be named where trade unionists who inaugurated this old, fossilized policy got into bitter controversies over the question as to whether a certain candidate or party was friendly to labor. Sides were taken and charges and countercharges were made until disruption became rampant and general disintegration was threatened. This scheme that has been resurrected by the great labor leaders at Washington has been responsible for more boodling and scandals than all other plans combined. It was tried in the palmy days of the old K. of L. and is a derelict of a period when class interests were not battled for one hundredth part as stubbornly as in our present highly centralized social state. But it is just what might have been expected from the source from which it emanates, and is truly characteristic of the glaring cowardice of those who are supposed to lead.

If there is any body of men who seem to have the original knack for doing the wrong thing at the right time and being consistently inconsistent, so to speak, commend me to the executive council of the A. F. of L..

and of which Gompers seems to be the whole thing. It was pointed out in last month's REVIEW that the psychological moment had arrived when the council ought to meet and consider ways and means to support the strikes of the miners and longshoremen that threatened. Well, they met, but instead of mapping out plans in support of the trade unionists on the firing line; instead of issuing a stirring address to the unorganized working people of the country to rally to the standard of organized labor and assist in beating back an arrogant plutocracy; instead of advising the various organizations and their members how best to lend their moral and financial aid to those who were likely to be plunged into a struggle that would effect every worker who carried a card, what do they do but practically ignore the industrial crisis confronting us and dabble with the most stupid and cowardly political humbuggery. They march down Pennsylvania avenue (it doesn't say whether they were accompanied by a brass band) to the White House and thence back to the Capitol and give as fine an exhibition of bourgeoisie "Schwanzpolitik" as has ever been seen in any country. Speeches are made and duly printed for consumption by the public and then come interviews galore, all of a political nature. Listen to Gompers, the high priest and spokesman of pure and simpledom:

"Labor is a slow moving body" (most decidedly when its alleged leaders do all in their power to hold labor in leash). "The men who toil and build up the wealth of the country have patiently borne injustice for years, and have each succeeding campaign given their suffrages to those who have claimed to be advocates of legislation to lighten the burdens of labor, but when called upon to keep faith with us we have been met with excuses and promises of doing something later on."

Note the admission that the men who toil have each succeeding campaign given their suffrages to those who have "claimed" to be advocates of legislation to lighten the burdens of labor, etc., but have not kept faith. Yet those of us who are not leaders are expected to continue the farce from hell to breakfast. Now let the "questioning of candidates," not that we need to "elect men from our own ranks to make new laws and administer them," be "aggressively prosecuted." As in the past, the Republican and Democratic parties will nominate for office, and especially for Congress, the "most representative citizens," successful business men and corporation lawyers, and they are to be quizzed, only to dodge the questions or make promises to be broken. Parry and his National Association of Manufacturers and Post and his Citizens' Industrial Association and the Foundrymen's Association and the United Typothetae and the National Metal Trades' Association and the Building Contractors' Associations and similar bodies, as well as the monopolies, trusts and combines are not worrying much if their henchmen on their capitalistic tickets are questioned. But it would bother them more than a little if their workingmen voters seceded from the old parties and built up a distinct class-conscious movement of their own, as has been done in every civilized country in the world except the United States, where we are blessed with "intellectual giants" as labor leaders, who are not in the least disturbed by all the capitalistic outrages from Homestead to Colorado. They sit around in conventions and tell each other now pure and simple they are (especially if some Socialist advocates labor class politics), and then when there is a great strike movement, a pure and simple industrial question, looming up on the horizon, they rush off down to Washington and talk politics and crawl upon their bellies before capitalistic politicians and spring schemes to inject the worst kind of political tactics into the unions.

Just at this juncture, with the most stupendous questions forcing themselves to the front that have ever confronted the American working people

—with capitalism centralizing so rapidly that a little Rockefeller is born with the power of \$5,000,000,000 of wealth in its power, with the trusts and combines in possession of all the great industrial institutions, with their political parties reeking with rottenness and graft, with employers' associations waging pitiless war upon everything that looks like a labor organization, with the drunken plutocracy even going to the extreme of demanding the blood of the Western miners' officials, and with strikes and lockouts threatening all over the country—I say that at just this point of our evolution the labor leaders in and out of the A. F. of L. seem to be going completely daft in their wild attempt to cling to pure and simpledom and rejecting political action.

I have already explained in the REVIEW how, at the Pittsburgh convention of the A. F. of L., Gompers ruled out of order two resolutions favoring political action along labor lines. One of them—presented by the cap-makers' national union—proposed that a committee be appointed to investigate and report on the advisability of starting a new political movement, somewhat along the lines, I judge, of the British Labor Rerepresentation Committee. Several weeks ago I met President Mahon, of the street railway employees, who instigated the unprecedented ruling, and inquired what scheme was at the bottom of the unexpected and high-handed move. "To keep the damned Socialists out of the conventions," he replied, very frankly. Gompers, Mahon, and their friends ought to have their dearest wish fulfilled. On the other side is the so-called Industrial Workers of the World, the leaders of which body seem to be racing to outdo the A. F. of L. ring in singing the song of pure and simpledom. In their speeches and their organs they sneer at political action—"dropping pieces of paper into a box," and the "Slowshulist" party is coming in for as bitter attacks as the original simperers of the Gompers' stripe ever dared to make. Indeed, active workers in the Socialist party all over the country have suddenly grown lukewarm in the effort to build up a political organization and are enthusiastically proclaiming the advantages of the "industrialism" offered by the wheel of fortune aggregation. Deleon and his dancing dervishes are running amuck and resorting to their old yell that whosoever refuses to join the I. W. W., instantler is a fakir, a traitor, and an all-around scoundrel. And not a few S. P. comrades, who ought to know better, have no hesitancy in mouthing the phrases of that sorry old adventurer. "See," they cry, "nothing has been accomplished in Germany and France and other countries after years of political fighting. Now we must organize industrially and prepare for the general strike. Down with trades autonomy; away with your political tomfoolery!"

Well, perhaps this craze will run its course after some of these enthusiastic brethren get their bumps. And get them they will, sooner or later. I want to make this statement and emphasize it as strongly as possible: The compactly organized capitalists of this country, whether they are in trusts or manufacturers' associations, don't care a rap to-day whether you are organized industrially or on trade autonomy lines. They have been and still are getting together to smash unionism, no matter what form it may take. The miners are on industrial lines and so are the longshoremen. No one will deny that they have not engaged in desperate struggles in the past. But their living conditions are no better than those of the most uncompromising trade autonomists, and they are in for still more hard fights in the future. "We might as well give battle to all the unions at once rather than one at a time," said a leading vessel owner of the Great Lakes. If the bosses are unable to obtain sufficient strike-breakers they will tie up their vessels and starve the longshoremen into submission. That is the program if a strike begins. The mine owners have mountains of coal and can sit back and watch prices go up while the miners

are being starved into terms. I might cite any number of contests in which strong industrial organizations, like the K. of L., A. R. U. and A. F. of L. internationals, went down in defeat, and always because the capitalist class controlled the powers of government. The industrial form of organization is, of course, the most scientific, but it is a waste of time and money to bother starting dual and rival unions, which means quarrels and bad feeling among the workers where there ought to be harmony and solidarity. Let us belong to the organizations that safeguard our interests, even though it be temporarily, and go on teaching the workers that their only hope for emancipation is through political action as a class. And while the A. F. of L., the I. W. W. and unaffiliated bodies seem to be swayed by reactionary policies for the time being, we can reflect that it is always darkest before dawn. It is immaterial what a few leaders may do. The time is not far distant when the rank and file, as a matter of self-preservation, will repudiate the old policies in many respects and accept the Socialist party program.

BOOK REVIEWS

COLONIAL ADMINISTRATION, by Paul S. Reinsch. The Macmillan Co. Half leather, 422 pp., \$125.

This is another work that shows how the influence of socialist thought and the socialist attitude of mind is permeating every field. Throughout the work the materialistic interpretation of history and evolutionary attitude is taken for granted. The various problems dealing with the administration of colonies under capitalism, for purposes of commercial exploitation are considered. While the effect of such measures upon the colonies themselves is given the main emphasis, it is the various methods in which these questions expose the workings of capitalism that is of most interest to the socialist leader. He disposes of the "moral" reasons for colonization as follows: "Having forcibly seized upon large tracts of land and established a claim of sovereignty over their inhabitants, the nations engaged in this movement looked for some moral principle upon which this procedure could be defended." In this chapter on education we find him applying the latest pedagogical ideas, for which the socialists have so long stood, and pointing out how essential is the evolutionary and economic point of view in new educational systems. It is impossible he tells us, to directly engraft European traditions upon people in another social stage and whatever form of education is established must be based on the economic needs of the people to be educated.

The chapter on "The Labor Question" is such an exposition of the socialist position on the wages question as one would scarcely look for on a book treating of "Colonial Administration." Here there is a full discussion of the various means which capitalism has been forced to adopt in order to compel people in other than the capitalistic stage of society to produce surplus value. Manifestly in tropical countries, where the workers can obtain a subsistence with very little labor, they will not work hard all day for the same subsistence. Consequently the first problem in every colony has been to find some way to prevent the natives from getting this easy living. In the Dutch colony of Saurinam where the cultivation of the banana afforded an easy escape from wage slavery the natives "were forbidden to cultivate bananas and existing banana fields were destroyed in large numbers." In the Congo Free State the forests which had been the common property of the natives from time immemorial were declared to be private property and the natives were forbidden to gather its products for themselves. In Rhodesia, Natal, Transvaal and other South African colonies a "hut tax" is imposed upon the natives so high that they can not possibly pay it without going to work for the capitalist exploiters. In some of the French colonies "vagrancy laws" have been enacted by which any one not working for wages is declared a vagrant, arrested and put to work. In the Amazon region and in Java a system of "credit bondage" by which the natives are induced to incur a small debt, which is then

carefully nursed and manipulated so as to be perpetual, is the scheme adopted. In the Dutch East Indies and in New Guiana, long time labor contracts are made with the natives, which they are then forced to observe under penalty of imprisonment and flogging. In East Sumatra, Samoa, and the Transvaal mines Chinese Coolies are introduced under contract. In Madagascar and the Dutch East Indies the feudal *corvée* (forced labor) has been introduced. All this has been done by nations who offer as one of the main excuses for colonization that they are engaged in abolishing slavery.

Although the work deals with a subject in which a socialist would scarcely look for material, yet we know of few books that are more suggestive of facts for the socialist worker than this.

THE TRIUMPH OF LIFE. By *Wilhelm Boelsche*, translated by *May Wood Simons*. Charles H. Kerr & Co., 157 pp., 50 cents.

This is a study of some phases of the theory of evolution, but the subject is approached from a wholly different point than that from which it is ordinarily considered. The theme of the book is that life is able to triumph over all obstacles and adjust itself to all possible conditions, until every nook and cranny of the surface of the earth is filled with its presence. In a somewhat fanciful and extremely interesting style the reader accompanies the author in an imaginary journey from some distant sun to the earth. He approaches this planet upon the dark side and over the ocean, passes through the phosphorescent animalculæ that cover the tropic seas, sinks deep down into the depths of the ocean, discovering and studying all the marvelous forms of life that have been adjusted in their development to the darkness and tremendous pressure of the ocean depths. Next we rise to a coral isle, itself a life product, and its every interstice permeated with other forms of life. An examination of the rocks show them to be but a great cemetery of earlier living forms and while examining these we penetrate deep into a cave where are discovered the first traces of the life of man. The early life of this first member of the human race, the cave man, is pictured most vividly before us. We see him at work, at play; we see the dawn of the art instinct, and the beginning of tools. Throughout the book we are impressed with the fact that it is a scientist who is writing and who is all the more a scientist because he is a socialist; and this makes the book of course even more valuable to the socialist reader.

ELEMENTS OF SOCIOLOGY. *Frank W. Blackmar*. Macmillan Co. Half-leather, 454 pp., \$1.25.

This is an attempt at reducing sociology to the text book stage and it can not be said to be a wholly successful one, although the author has undoubtedly developed an outline which to a large extent forecasts the direction along which future work will be done. The work is divided into seven "books" with the titles as follows: "The Nature and Import of Sociology," "Social Evolution," "Socialization and Social Control," "Social Ideals," "Social Pathology," "Methods of Social Investigation," "The History of Sociology." There is little recognition of the fundamental industrial characteristics of social institutions and there are a vast number of platitudes and half truths which detract from the value of the book. Whenever he does touch any point which may have a bearing on practical activity these platitudes generally have a distinctly capitalistic tinge as for instance, where he repeats the fundamental of the Samuel Smiles style of philosophy that "It is possible on account of the opportunities offered,

for the individual to pass from one group to another, and from the conditions of poverty to a condition of wealth. The common laborer of to-day may pass to the rank of capitalist and manager of business to-morrow." It is almost like a voice from the tombs, even in capitalist writings, which make any pretence of a scientific character, to be told "that thousands become poor even to the slavery of poverty because they do not understand and practice the art of economy." Surely no man who pretends to write a sociology should be ignorant of the fact which has been so often demonstrated that economy when applied to "thousands" simply lowers the standard of life instead of elevating individuals. The trifling discussion of socialism which he gives is only sufficient to show his ignorance of the subject and in his bibliography not one reference is made to a socialist writer. He has no conception of socialism as a philosophy of society and, of course makes no mention of the materialistic interpretation of history or the socialist philosophy of the class struggle. The whole book on "Social Pathology" is based on the idea that poverty in present society is abnormal and "pathological" and not an absolutely essential portion of that society and if we are to use the medical analogy a physiological characteristic. His history of sociology makes no mention of the socialist writers, although he includes several who have stolen all that they have "contributed" to the science from socialist writers. It is probable that this book will become a beginning text book in sociology in many high schools and colleges and as such will supply several thousand students with a lot of information (?) which they will have to carefully unlearn when they get out.

THE WORLD'S REVOLUTIONS, by *Ernest Untermann, Charles H. Kerr and Co.* Cloth, 176 pp. 50 cents.

In the first chapter on "The Individual and the Universe" we have a vivid picture, drawn from the personal experience of the writer, of a shipwrecked mariner on an island in the South Pacific. With this incident as text, it is shown how even so isolated an individual as this lone sailor would appear to be is united with the closest ties, not only to all mankind, past and present, but to the whole cosmical scheme in the uttermost ends of the universe.

The chapters on "Primitive Human Revolutions" is a simple striking description of the great pre-historic revolutions, both physical and human. Here we watch the dawn of invention and see the beginning of a social institution.

Chapter three, "The Roman Empire and its Proletariat" brings before us the class struggles of ancient Rome. We see the first beginning of working class resistance to tyranny and the mental preparation for the next social stage.

Chapter four is on "The Christian Proletariat and its Mission." This is almost the first attempt to treat biblical history in the light of modern materialism and it throws a bright illumination upon many points. We see the growth of the Jewish people, the economic preparation for the coming of Jesus and the part which he played as a social revolutionist. This revolution was turned aside and its energy exploited by the ruling class under Constantine, "Jesus had transformed the Jewish God of hate into a God of love and a Prince of Peace. The church of possessing christians moulded him into a hideous monstrosity, a God of love who is God of hate and a Prince of Peace who brings a sword. . . . But the modern proletarian remembers the cross on Golgotha."

Chapter five, "Feudal Ecclesiasticism and its Disintegration":—"The

betrayal of the Christian movement by the wealthy christians did not save the Roman state. It had disrupted the proletarian organization, but it could not do away with the proletariat. Much less would it abolish the conditions which created the proletariat. So the Roman Empire fell to pieces." On its ruins sprang the feudalism of the middle-ages, which is analyzed, and its progress described with its proletarian revolt and its ecclesiastical tyranny until it had begun to disintegrate under the influence of the beginning of capitalism.

Chapter six, "The American Revolution and its Reflex in France": Here for the first time America enters into world history. In a short space it passes through the stages that have taken centuries in other countries until the ruling classes of America found need for a government which they could control and issued a Declaration of Independence. When the revolution had been fought it was found that King George had only been supplanted by King Capital.

Chapter seven, "Bourgeois Revolutions in Europe": "The history of Bourgeois revolutions is a succession of compromises much boasting and wordy valor before the commencement of hostilities, and vacillations in moments of supreme decision, and in incapacity for grasping the full fruits of victory gained for them by others. That is the ever recurring spectacle in every attempt of the bourgeois leaders to gain control of the political power.....History brands them as the most incapable and aimless class that ever held the helm of society. And it will write upon the grave of the bourgeoisie the flaming epitaph: 'Here lies the capitalist class—a traitor to its ideals, incompetent in government and an enemy to mankind'."

The last chapter treats the "Proletarian World Movement," sums up the forces that have gone to lay the foundations of that revolution and make it invincible, and offers a suggestion of its goal.

The book is an important addition to the educational and propaganda literature of Socialism.

UNDERFED SCHOOL CHILDREN, *The Problem and the Remedy.* By John Spargo. Charles H. Kerr & Co., paper, 29 pages, 10 cents.

This is just the sort of socialist pamphlets that are needed at the present moment. It does not attempt to give the whole philosophy and economies of Socialism, but occupies itself definitely and distinctly with one problem and treats this well. Statistics are presented to show that between one and two million children of school age are continuously underfed in the United States and as such are incapable of meeting the demands of school life in any means greatly advantageous to themselves. This statement of the problem is then followed with a mass of facts on "How Foreign Municipalities Feed Their School Children." The school restaurants of Germany, France, Switzerland, and Italy are described in a manner that makes an effective argument for their establishment in this country. There has appeared no better pamphlet for propaganda work in municipal campaigns than this one.

THE NEW CHIVALRY. By Bertha S. Wilkins. *The Chicago Socialist*, paper, 23 pages, 10 cents.

This little story must prove an excellent means of introducing socialism to non-socialists. It is based on the Cripple Creek strike. The hero is a black-listed miner who with his family is travelling eastward on a train with a capitalist who is a main mover on the mine owner side. The two discuss Socialism while a series of interesting and sometimes highly dramatic situations arise.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

WHAT TO READ ON SOCIALISM.

This is the title of a new book of sixty-four large pages, a copy of which will be mailed free to any one requesting it. Those desiring the book mailed to a list of names must send one cent for each name. It contains full descriptions of all the books published by Charles H. Kerr & Co., together with an explanation of the principles of socialism. We give here a condensed price list of a part of the books that are fully described in "What to Read on Socialism."

STANDARD SOCIALIST SERIES.

Uniformly bound in cloth, 50c each, postpaid.

1. Karl Marx: Biographical Memoirs by Wilhelm Liebknecht, translated by Ernest Untermann.
2. Collectivism and Industrial Evolution. By Emile Vandervelde, translated by Charles H. Kerr.
3. The American Farmer, an Economic and Historical Study. By A. M. Simons.
4. The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association. By Isaac Broome.
5. The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. By Frederick Engels, translated by Ernest Untermann.
6. The Social Revolution. By Karl Kautsky, translated by A. M. and May Wood Simons.
7. Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. By Frederick Engels.
8. Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy. By Frederick Engels.
9. American Pauperism and the Abolition of Poverty. By Isador Ladoff.
10. Britain for the British (America for the Americans). By Robert Blachford.
11. The Communist Manifesto, by Marx and Engels; and, No Compromise, by Liebknecht.
12. The Positive School of Criminology. By Enrico Ferri, translated by Ernest Untermann.
13. The World's Revolution. By Ernest Untermann.
14. The Socialists, Who they Are and What they Stand for. By John Spargo.
15. Social and Philosophical Studies. By Paul Lafargue, translated by Charles H. Kerr. (In preparation.)

LIBRARY OF SCIENCE FOR THE WORKERS.

Uniformly bound in cloth, 50c each, postpaid.

1. The Evolution of Man. By Wilhelm Boelsche, translated by Ernest Untermann.
2. Germs of Mind in Plants. By R. H. Francé. Translated by A. M. Simons.
3. The End of the World. By Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer, translated by Margaret Wagner.
4. Science and Revolution. By Ernest Untermann.
5. The Triumph of Life. By Wilhelm Boelsche, translated by May Wood Simons.
6. Life and Death. By Dr. E. Teichmann, translated by A. M. Simons. (In press, ready in May.)
7. The Making of the World. By Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer, translated by Ernest Untermann. (In press, ready in May.)

THE INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.

Large volumes in extra cloth, uniform stamping, \$1.00 each, postpaid.

1. The Changing Order. By Oscar Lovell Triggs, Ph. D.
2. Better-World Philosophy. By J. Howard Moore.
3. The Universal Kinship. By J. Howard Moore.
4. Principles of Scientific Socialism. By Rev. Charles H. Vail.
5. Some of the Philosophical Essays on Socialism and Science, Religion, Ethics, Critique of Reason and the World at large. By Joseph Dietzgen, translated by M. Beer and Th. Rothstein. Edited by Eugene Dietzgen. (Ready about April 20th.)
6. Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History. By Antonio Labriola, translated by Charles H. Kerr. Second edition.
7. Love's Coming-of-Age. By Edward Carpenter. Cloth, \$1.00.

OTHER SOCIALIST BOOKS.

In Cloth Binding.

- God's Children. A Modern Allegory. By James Allman. 50 cents.
- The Recording Angel. By Edwin Arnold Brenholtz. \$1.00.
- The Voice of Equality. By Edwin Arnold Brenholtz. \$1.00.
- Towards Democracy. By Edward Carpenter. \$2.50.
- The Socialization of Humanity. By Charles Kendall Franklin. \$2.00.
- The Sale of an Appetite. By Paul Lafargue, translated by Charles H. Kerr. 50 cents.
- The Principles of Social Progress. A Study of Civilization. By Jas. Bale Morman, A. B. 50 cents.
- Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalistic Production. By Karl Marx. Translated from the Third German Edition, by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling, and edited by Frederick Engels. \$2.00.
- Walt Whitman. The Poet of the Wider Selfhood. By Mila Tupper Maynard. \$1.00.
- Poems of Walt Whitman. 75 cents.
- Rebels of the New South. A novel. By Walter Marion Raymond. \$1.00.
- Socialism, and the Social Movement in the Nineteenth Century. By Prof. Werner Sombart, of the University of Breslau. \$1.00.
- Modern Socialism. By Charles H. Vail. 75 cents.
- The Ancient Lowly: A History of the Ancient Working People, from the Earliest Known Period to the Adoption of Christianity by Constantine. By C. Osborne Ward. Two large volumes, \$4.00. Either volume sold separately at \$2.00.

MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS.

In Cloth Binding.

- God and My Neighbor. By Robert Blatchford. \$1.00.
 Thoughts of a Fool. By Evelyn Gladys. \$1.00.
 Mind and Body: Hypnotism and Suggestion Applied in Therapeutics and Education. By Alvan C. Halphide, M. D.
 The Psychic and Psychism. By Alvan C. Halphide, M. D.
 American Communities. By William Alfred Hinds. \$1.00.
 Gracia, a Social Tragedy. By Frank Everett Plummer. \$1.25.

SOCIALIST BOOKS.

In Paper Covers.

- A Study in Government. By Henry E. Allen. 5 cents.
 Merrie England (Letters to John Smith, Workingman.) By Robert Blatchford. 10 cents.
 Plutocracy's Statistics. Statistical Lies and Liars Exposed by H. L. Bliss. 10 cents.
 Socialist Songs, Dialogues and Recitations. Compiled by Josephine R. Cole. 25 cents.
 Crime and Criminals. By Clarence S. Darrow. 10 cents.
 Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. By Frederick Engels. 10 cents.
 The Day of Judgment. By George D. Herron. 10 cents.
 Objectors to Socialism Answered. By Charles C. Hitchcock. 5 cents.
 Life of Frederick Engels. By Karl Kautsky. Translated by May Wood Simons. 10 cents.
 Socialism and Human Nature, Do They Conflict? By Murray E. King. 10 cents.
 The Republic of Plato. Translated into English by Alexander Kerr, Professor of Greek in the University of Wisconsin. 60 cents.
 Socialist Songs with Music. Compiled by Charles H. Kerr. 20 cents.
 Socialism and the Intellectuals. By Paul Lafargue. 5 cents.
 Socialism, What It Is and What It Seeks to Accomplish. By Wilhelm Liebknecht. Translated by May Wood Simons. 10 cents.
 No Compromise, No Political Trading. By Wilhelm Liebknecht. Translated by A. M. Simons and Marcus Hitch. 10 cents.
 Capital and Labor. By a Black-Listed Machinist. 25 cents.
 Manifesto of the Communist Party. By Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. 10 cents.
 Katherine Breshkovsky—"For Russia's Freedom." By Ernest Poole. 10 cents.
 The Economic Foundation of Art. By A. M. Simons. 5 cents.
 Class Struggles in America. By A. M. Simons. Second edition revised and enlarged. 10 cents.
 Socialism vs. Single Tax: A Verbatim Report of a Debate held at Twelfth Street Turner Hall, Chicago, December 20, 1903. For Socialism: Ernest Untermann, Seymour Stedman, A. M. Simons. For Single Tax: Louis F. Post, Henry H. Hardinge, John Z. White. 25 cents.
 The Socialist Campaign Book. Edited under the supervision of the National Campaign Committee of the Socialist Party. 25 cents.
 Underfed School Children—The Problem and the Remedy. By John Spargo. 10 cents.
 Forces That Make for Socialism in America. By John Spargo. 10 cts.
 The Socialist Movement. By Rev. Charles H. Vail. 10 cents.
 Modern Socialism. By Rev. Charles H. Vail. 25 cents.
 Principles of Scientific Socialism. By Rev. Charles H. Vail. 35 cents.
 The Kingdom of Heaven Is at Hand. By C. W. Wooldridge, M. D. 10 cents.

THE NEWEST BOOKS.

Dietzgen's Philosophical Essays, fully described in an article by Ernest Untermann in this issue of the REVIEW, is now in press, and we expect to have copies ready before the end of April. It is the fourth volume of the International Library of Social Science, and will be printed on paper of extra quality and handsomely bound, like the other volumes of this series. Read Comrade Unterman's article and you will realize the importance of this book of Dietzgen to any one wishing to understand socialism. The price is \$1.00, with the usual discount to stockholders.

The World's Revolutions, by Ernest Untermann, is just ready. For a full description, see pages 18 and 19 of "What to Read on Socialism," a copy of which will be mailed to any one requesting it. This latest work by Untermann is at once popular in style, original and instructive. His chapter on "The Christian Proletariat and its Mission," should not be missed by any one wishing to grasp the real meaning of the mass of facts brought together by Osborne Ward in "The Ancient Lowly." The price of "The World's Revolutions" is fifty cents.

The next new book in the Standard Socialist Series will be "The Socialists," by John Spargo. We do not often indulge in superlatives, but we believe that this is beyond question the best propaganda book on socialism that has yet been published. It is short, so that we have been enabled to use good type, heavy paper and wide margins and still come within the size of a fifty cent book. It is absolutely clear in its socialism, with not a trace of sentimentality nor of opportunism. At the same time the theory of the class struggle is stated in a calm, scientific fashion that will not enrage the reader to whom the idea is a new one. Lastly, the book is written in pure, strong English that will be intelligible to the uneducated reader and will commend the substance of the book to the educated reader. Every socialist writer and speaker will find the book suggestive for its concise presentation of the socialist argument, but the great value of the book is for the new inquirer who has just begun to study socialism.

Comrade Spargo has given the copyright of this book to our co-operative publishing house. Every dollar received from its sale will go into the circulation of more socialist books. Copies will be ready about April 20th. Every reader of the REVIEW should order one to be mailed on publication. Price 35 cents postpaid to stockholders, 50 cents to others.

THE COMPANY'S FINANCES.

Book sales for March amounted to \$1,090.41; REVIEW subscriptions and sales to \$173.91. The only cash contributions received during the month were 70 cents from J. Feurle, 30 cents from W. I. Angell and \$1.85 from H. M. Wilson. The receipts from the sale of stock during the month were \$292.15.

We need to do better than this in April, for this month we have to meet the cost of moving, which will be heavy. The rent of the rooms on the fifth floor of the Garden City Block, which we have been occupying, has been raised to \$75.00 a month, which is a great deal more than the space is worth, and we have secured larger quarters on the ground floor at a much lower rental, by moving just outside the "loop." Our new location is at 264 East Kinzie street, a little east of State street, and only three blocks from the corner of State and Lake. This is really more accessible from most parts of the city than our old quarters, and we shall have the necessary room in which to grow. Come and see us after April 20th.